

QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS : POSTHOMERICA XII, A
COMMENTARY

Malcolm Campbell

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1979

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/15488>

This item is protected by original copyright

QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS:

POSTHOMERICA XII

A Commentary

by

Malcolm Campbell

A thesis submitted in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of St. Andrews.



ProQuest Number: 10171095

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10171095

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 9183

ABSTRACT

This commentary sets out (i) to monitor closely a sizable portion of imperial Greek epic poetry, and to arrive, on the basis of available evidence (viz., extant Greek poetry, primarily), at an idea of the funds (both linguistic and thematic) at the disposal of such a poet; (ii) to determine, as a next step, whether this poet has, as is commonly alleged, had access to Roman poetry—— again on the basis of available evidence (viz., most genres of Roman poetry); and (iii) to reexamine from the primary sources the three important mythical tales contained therein (viz., those concerning Sinon, Laocoon and Cassandra).

The demands of (i) are (and can only be) satisfied by ample documentation from Greek poetry, of whatever date, genre or provenance. Quintus' literary background can now be viewed in a proper light. The evidence for (ii) is (perhaps unavoidably, given the nature of the problem) inconclusive as far as components external to (iii) are concerned, but see Index AI(v), and the Postscript; in any event the need to look far beyond the immediate issues is evident. On the question of Roman utilisation for (iii) there is no doubt: none existed. That apart, reexamination of the myths has, I believe, contributed some new and concrete results.

Emphasis is placed throughout on conveying to the reader in concise form information not hitherto assembled; and on highlighting some aspects of this work that have received little attention at the expense of topics for which an abundance of secondary literature is already to hand.

Detailed indexes are provided.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by myself, that the work of which it is a record has been done by myself, and that it has not been accepted in any previous application for a higher degree.

(signed) *Malcolm Campbell*

Malcolm Campbell,

candidate for the degree of Ph.D.

STATEMENT

I certify that I was admitted into the University of St. Andrews as a part-time research student in October 1969; but that, with due permission from the Faculty of Arts, the present work was embarked upon in October 1975. The research has been carried out from that date on a part-time basis,

(signed) *Malcolm Campbell*

Malcolm Campbell,

candidate for the degree of Ph.D.

I hereby certify that Malcolm Campbell has been engaged upon research work under my supervision and that he has fulfilled the conditions of Resolution no.1 and that he is qualified to submit the accompanying thesis in application for the degree of Ph.D.

..... Supervisor

PREFACE

This commentary is designed to be read side by side with the Budé edition of F. Vian; the lemmata diverge from this text only very occasionally in cases where I revert to the transmitted reading. It arose from a desire to know (i) what linguistic and conceptual resources were available to a Greek epic poet of the empire; (ii) whether those resources could be held to be in any way dependent on acquaintance with Roman poetry—for until the relevant data on (i) are to hand we are in no position to argue about let alone pronounce upon (ii); and (iii) whether it was possible to delve deeper into the fascinating tales of Sinon, Laocoon and Cassandra: Q., lacking the dazzling splendour of a Virgil and the inanity of a Triphiodorus, seemed a suitable springboard: he is at least businesslike.

The Posthomerica has been called a 'comfortable' poem. It is not comfortable in the sense that it is still possible to offer new lines of approach, and sometimes to raise new questions, about mythical and other elements in the work; and to widen the horizons of the topic of alleged utilisation of Roman poetry—for those who insist on 'Romanisation' (and it is with them that the onus of proof must lie) do so with a vociferousness, ~~narrowness of outlook~~ and confidence wholly out of tune with their partial use or complete disregard of relevant evidence. I hope that they will shake off some very bad habits; and that they will reflect, constantly and earnestly, that our ignorance of trends and developments in Greek epic composition between Apollonius and Quintus is all but total.

There is no formal introduction: I have preferred to deal with questions as they present themselves in the commentary; and the indexes are rather fuller and, I trust, more informative than those normally encountered in a work of this nature.

The works of Francis Vian set the study of Quintus on a solid basis. If his name appears less frequently than anticipated in the following pages, it is only because I take his writings to be read. I am indebted to him more particularly for a number of remarks on xii which he has kindly allowed me to incorporate in the commentary.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS; BIBLIOGRAPHY	iii
COMMENTARY	1
NOTES TO COMMENTARY	211
INDEXES:	223
A	
I Quintus: (i) Composition (ii) Q. and Homer (iii) Language (iv) Source Material (v) <u>Res Romanae</u>	
II <u>Epica</u>	
III <u>Mythologica</u>	
IV Miscellaneous	
B	
Ancient Authors	
C	
Greek Index	
ADDENDA	246
POSTSCRIPT	247

ABBREVIATIONS;BIBLIOGRAPHY

A.Ancient Authors.

1.Greek.

(a)As in LSJ + Supplement(but sometimes more explicitly,e.g.'Bacch.' not 'B.',with some exceptions,including:-

A - Ω ; $\alpha - \omega$:Il.;Od.

i-xiv:Q.S.

Christod. + line-number:=AP 2....

Gr.Naz.:the Carmina are cited from the(very inconvenient)edition of Migne's, Patrologia Graeca vol.37,first by page-number then by the line on that page; other material not from vol.38 but from AP.

Man.:by this I mean 'Manethoniana'. References are made with a single book-number.

Nonn.: 'Nonn.2.91' refers to the Dionysiaca(but 'D.' is added where an ambiguity might arise);but:Nonn.Met.

(b)Collections. Those marked * are cited by the continuous(line or fr.) numbering.

(i)

CA:J.U.Powell,Collectanea Alexandrina,Oxford 1925.

*EpGr...Page:D.L.Page,Epigrammata Graeca,Oxford 1975.

†GDK :E.Heitsch,Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit, Bd.I,2.Aufl.,Göttingen 1963;Bd.II,Göttingen 1964.

*GPh:A.S.F.Gow and D.L.Page,The Greek Anthology:the Garland of Philip,Cambridge 1968.

*HE:id.,...Hellenistic Epigrams,Cambridge 1965.

IEG:M.L.West,Iambi et Elegi Graeci,Oxford 1971-2.

*PLF:E.Lobel and D.L.Page,Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta,Oxford 1955.

*PMG:D.L.Page,Poetae Melici Graeci,Oxford 1962.

SLG:id.,Supplementum Lyricis Graecis,Oxford 1974.

The summaries of Il.Parv.,Il.Pers.etc. are cited by line-number from A.Severyns,Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus,tome iv,Paris 1963.

'Parke-Wormell' refers to the collection of oracular responses in the

second volume of their Delphic Oracle, Oxford 1956.

†But Dion. Bass. from E. Livrea, Dionysii Bassaricon et Gigantiadis Fragmenta, Rome 1973.

(ii) Metrical inscriptions. Apart from IG/SEG note:-

EpGr... Kaibel: G. Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta, Berlin 1878.

GES: J. Ebert, Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen, Abh. Sächs. Akad. der Wiss. Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Band 63 Heft 2, 1972, no. 64.

GVI: W. Peek, Griechische Vers-Inschriften, Bd. I: Grab-Epigramme, Berlin 1955.

IME: E. Bernand, Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine, Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, vol. 98, Paris 1969.

2. Roman.

As in The Oxford Latin Dictionary and/or Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. But

(i) Petr. + line-number refers to the Troiae halosis in Sat. 89. (ii) Claudian's poems: as recommended in Alan Cameron's Claudian.

B. BOOKS AND ARTICLES.

Periodicals: as in L'Année Philologique.

The following list is confined to works cited in the body of the commentary on more than two occasions; it does not include references to familiar standard commentaries. Older literature on Q. is catalogued in Vian, Rech. 7-15: most is of little, much of no value, and I have in general profited more from a number of able and discerning reviews of the Bude' texts.

Arend:

(W.) Die typischen Szenen bei Homer, Berlin 1933.

Bechtel:

(F.) Lexilogus zu Homer, Halle 1914.

Bissinger:

(M.) Das Adjectiv ΜΕΡΑΣ in der griechischen Dichtung, Diss. München 1966.

Bruchmann:

(C.F.H.) Epitheta Deorum..., Leipzig 1893.

Buttmann:

(Ph.) Lexilogus...für Homer und Hesiod, Berlin 1865⁴.

Castiglioni:

ByzJ 2, 1921, 33f.

Cauer:

(P.) Grundfragen der Homerkritik, Leipzig 1921-3³.

Cesareo:

RIFC n.s.6, 1928, 231f.

Chantraine:

(P.) Grammaire homérique, Paris 1948-53.

Chantraine, ^F~~Form~~.:

La formation des noms en Grec ancien, Paris 1933.

Coles:

The Hypothesis of Euripides' Alexandros, in BICS suppl.32, 1974 [cf. Luppe, Philologus 120, 1976, 12f.]

Davreux:

(J.) La légende de la prophétesse Cassandre, Liège 1942.

Dodds:

(E.R.) The Greeks and the Irrational, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1951.

Doederlein:

(L.) Homerisches Glossarium, Erlangen 1850-8.

Duckworth:

AJPh 57, 1936, 58f.

Ebeling:

(H.; ed.) Lexicon Homericum, Leipzig 1880-5.

Erbse:

Gnomon 43, 1971, 563f.

Fehling:

(D.) Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias, Berlin 1969.

Follet:

REA 72, 1970, 177f.

Fränkel:

(H.) Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios, Munich 1968.

Golega:

(J.) Der homerische Psalter, Ettal 1960.

Graz:

(L.) Le feu dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée, Paris 1965.

Gruber:

(J.) Über einige abstrakte Begriffe des frühen Griechischen, Meisenheim 1963.

Heinze:

(R.) Virgils epische Technik, Leipzig 1957⁴.

Jacobsohn:

Hermes 45, 1910, 99f.

James:

(A.W.) Index in Halieutica Oppiani Cilicis et in Cynegetica poetae Apameensis,
Hildesheim 1970.

Kakridis:

(Ph.I.) Κόιντος Σμυρναῖος, Athens 1962.

Kehmptzow:

(F.) De Quinti Smyrnaei fontibus ac mythopoeia, Diss. Kiel 1891.

Keydell:

Gnomon 33, 1961, 280f.

Keydell, 1931:

JAW 230, 1931, 75f.

Kleinknecht:

Hermes 79, 1944, 66f.

Knight:

(W.F.Jackson) Vergil's Troy, Oxford 1932.

Kühner-Gerth:

Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II Teil besorgt von B.Gerth,
Hannover 1898-1904.

Kullmann:

(W.) Die Quellen der Ilias, in Hermes: Einzelschriften 14, 1960.

La Roche:

(J.) Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum, Leipzig 1866.

La Roche, HU:

Homerische Untersuchungen, Leipzig 1869-93.

Lehrs:

(K.) De Aristarchi studiis Homericis, Leipzig 1882³.

Leumann:

(M.) Homerische Wörter, Basel 1950.

LexfrEp:

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos, Göttingen 1955-.

Lloyd-Jones:

CR n.s. 17, 1967, 274f.

Ludwich:

(A.) Aristarchs homerische Textkritik, Leipzig 1884-5.

Noack:

GGA 2, 1892, 769f.

Page:

(D.L.) History and the Homeric Iliad, Berkeley 1959.

Peek:

(W.; ed.) Lexikon zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos, Hildesheim 1968-75.

Platt:

JPh 27, 1901, 103f.

Rank:

(L.P.) Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus, Assen 1951.

Robert:

(C.) Die griechische Heldensage, Berlin 1923.

Ruijgh:

(C.J.) L'élément achéen dans la langue épique, Assen 1957.

Ruijgh, TE :

Autour de TE épique, Amsterdam 1971.

Scarcella:

GIF 24, 1972, 515f.

Schneider:

(H.) Vergleichende Untersuchungen zur sprachlichen Struktur der beiden erhaltenen Lehrgedichte des Nikander von Kolophon, Wiesbaden 1962.

Schneider, ^C~~Call~~.:

(O.) Callimachea, Leipzig 1870-3.

Schwyzler:

(E.) Griechische Grammatik, Munich 1939-50.

Stubbe:

Die Verseinlagen im Petron, in Philologus Suppl.-Bd. 25.2, 1933, 23f.

Svensson:

(A.) Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik, Lund 1937.

Trumpy:

(H.) Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos, Basel 1950.

Vian:

Budé text of Q., tome i. 1963, ii. 1966, iii. 1969; Notice refers to the Notice to book xii.

Vian*:

letter to M.C., 16.v. 1978.

Vian, Rech.:

Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne, Paris 1959.

Wackernagel:

(J.) Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Göttingen 1916.

Wernicke:

Triphiodori Ilii Excidium, rec. F.A. Wernicke, Leipzig 1819.

West:

(M.L.) CR n.s. 14, 1964, 257f.

West, PP:

(S.) The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer (Papyrologica Coloniensia iii), 1967.

Calchas on the basis of an omen declares that Troy must be taken by trickery.

It is easy to assert¹ that Q. has combined the traditional detail² of Odysseus' device of the Horse with Sinon's claim in Virg.A.2.185f. that Calchas 'ordered' the Greeks to build it. Even if the detail is Virg.'s own³, in Q. Calchas' intervention is grounded in reality, is based on a wholly different set of circumstances, is strategically necessary (an effective method of crushing the stiff opposition put up by the god-fearing Neoptolomos, a motif certainly not of Q.'s own devising: 66-103n.), and must be viewed against the background of a tradition in which oracles, prophecies and portents abound⁴, and in which Calchas came to assume an increasingly dominant role⁵. Q.'s Calchas indeed (for his teaming up with Odysseus cf. the n. on 360-88, § 4(a)(ii)) is a leading light in decision making both before and after the fall of Troy⁶. His Trojan counterpart Helenos, so popular elsewhere, is virtually driven out of the action: he is a fighter viii.252f., xi.348f.; a seer, though not explicitly so, only in the chaotic prophecy of Hera at x.346f.

Calchas is on the scene at this point in the saga in Dictys 5.7: he predicts that Troy will fall into Greek hands on the basis of an omen involving an eagle carrying a victim's entrails. The doubly inept Triph.172f. is worth a passing glance; the 'aged' Calchas is in the Horse, and in his capacity as a seer he is well aware (εὖ εἰδώς) that the Greeks were at long last going to take Troy. — Triph.'s work is full of uneasy compromises: at 132f. Odysseus is made to draw an unfavourable comparison between the 'aged' Calchas (he is presumably there listening) who 'put off' the capture of the city and the 'foreign seer' Helenos who was now bringing the Greeks in sight of victory. More important, I think, is Petron.1f.: the war was now ten years old, and

vatis fides

Calchantis atro dubia pendebat metu,

cum Delio profante caesi vertices

Idae trahuntur

According to Stubbe(32) Delio profante is an error prompted by a muddled

recollection of Sinon's tale in Virg. A.2.114 ~ 121, since pro Troia stabat Apollo. The gods of saga do not operate as Stubbe thinks they do. Calchas is Apollo's protégé, and the skills implanted in him are operative in Q. (cf. 4) to set in motion the final stage of the war. It may well be that Delio profante specifically is due to Virgilian influence, but it is interesting none the less that Petr., whose account diverges from Virg.'s in a number of acceptable ways⁷, forges a direct link between Calchas and the manufacturing of the Horse; in Sinon's rigmarole the oracular response has nothing to do with the Horse, which is already built (112f.).

Odysseus did not enjoy a monopoly for inventiveness. There were other contenders for this, the crowning triumph of the war: the seers Prylis (Lyc. 219f. with schol., see Radke in RE 23.1150) and Helenos (Conon F34, Dictys 5.9, 11), the latter's claim being a natural consequence of the common statement that Helenos predicted the city's capture (Il. Parv. 212, [Apollod.] 5.10 etc.); the sequence Helenos-Neoptolemos-Palladium-Horse is spelled out in rambling fashion by Triph. (51f. cf. 133f.). So too Calchas' prediction that Troy would fall 'in the tenth year' (B 323f., cf. vi. 61-2 and the confused viii. 475-7) was matched in the Cypria by a similar one from Anios king of Delos⁸.

1-2

The long and weary struggle of the Greeks (cf. the 'tired' Greeks in Catul. 64.366 ~ Hor. Carm. 2.4.11, [Sinon in] Virg. A.2.109) and their inability to take Troy are disposed of in a brief preface: so, from the Trojan side of the fence, Virg. A.2.13-4, Petr. 1f. Triph., in contrast, taking as his starting-point the arrival of Helenos on the scene (45f.; with 6 ἡδὲ μὲν δεκάτοιο cf. the preface in [Apollod.] 5.8 ἡδὲ δὲ... δεκάτοιο), exploits the familiar theme of the weariness and discomforts of war (cf. B 134f.; A. Ag. 555f.; S. Aj. 1185f.) in highly charged and ponderous language.

Whether the intervention of Calchas is traditional or not (see above), we are dealing here, I think, with a doublet (of which there ~~are~~ is an abundance in the Trojan saga as in others⁹) of the command issued by him to fetch the Palladium, an event which Silius Italicus (in a too often ignored

passage) introduces in strikingly similar language (13.36-8, 41):

longo miles [cf. $\alpha^2\chi\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$].. quateret cum Teucoria bello
Pergama, et ad muros staret sine sanguine Mavors,
sollicitis Calchas ...
sed Calchas Danaïs...

With this may be compared [Apollod.] loc.cit.(... Κάλχας θεοπίσει), and Hyginus' preface to the Horse-episode (108).

Lines 1-2 are acceptable in isolation as a preface to a fresh major episode in the war, but they seem less happy when taken in conjunction with the close of the previous book. $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu$ evidently picks up xi.500-1 $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\epsilon\prime\ \epsilon\phi\iota\nu\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \delta\eta\rho\acute{o}\nu...$ / $\epsilon\beta\kappa\epsilon\ \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$ (for the unit $\lambda\lambda'\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \delta\eta$ here cf. Mügler, Hermes 78, 1943, 27f.; Woodhouse, CQ n.s.2, 1952, 100f.): however, no attempt is made to explain the outcome of the fighting in its own context: an Achaean withdrawal is not so much as hinted at (ctr. ix.325f.). One may detect a general absence of narrative strategy and a tendency to leave a number of loose ends untied in almost every book of Q. (some striking examples in Vian, Notice to x, pp.14-15). The conclusion that Q. is a sloppy writer who flounders when confronted with a multitude of sources or sinks when he has none readily suggests itself and may be true. But arguably a poet who compares favourably with the majority of his imperial counterparts (he writes passable hexameters¹⁰) would be capable of avoiding elementary and restricted flaws in plot, and one may at least wonder whether we are dealing with a work that betrays signs of (unavoidably?) premature circulation: cf. Koechly, Proleg. xxxi-xxxiii.

1

This line is mirrored by xiii.78 (Greek penetration of Troy). $\lambda\lambda'...$
 $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$: a surprisingly rare run: [Opp.] Cyn. 1.487 ($\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\nu$); vi.498 ($\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota'$)
 Analogous formations are common enough: A.R. 1.655; ix.125, xiii.78; [Orph.] A.
 301 etc. $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu$: $\Theta 22\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\epsilon\prime\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\iota\tau\epsilon$ (v.1.- $\eta\tau\epsilon$) / \sim
 x.18 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu.\pi.\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\epsilon\iota\nu$ /. Similar wording is employed at xiii.301-2, 470.
 Cf. also Homer's $\mu.\pi.\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\nu$ (same sedes), and B 255-6 $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}.. / \eta\prime\rho\omega\epsilon\varsigma$
 $\Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\omicron\iota' .. \delta'...$ $\tau\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\alpha\ \tau\rho\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma$: cf. viii.427; xiii.78 ($\tau\omicron\tau\iota\ \tau.$); xi.434

(παρὰ κλυτὰ τ. after Φ 295... Ἰλιόφῃ κλυτὰ τ.); ix.538-9 κλυτὰ τ. // Τροίης.⁴
Homer calls Troy εὐτείχεος, uses Τροίη often enough of the fortress (not
much less frequently than Ἰλίου, 75:118, cf. Page 293), and has at B 691, Δ 378
(πρὸς) τείχεα Θήβης/ — but never τείχεα Τροίης/, an expression which
is in fact curiously uncommon outside Q.: Or. Sib. 11.132 (resume of fall of
Troy) κλυτὰ τείχεα Τροίης/; A. Ch. 363-4 ὑπὸ Τρωϊάς τείχεσσι (E. IA 762-3 ἐπὶ
περγάμων Τρωϊάς ἀμφί τε τείχη) ~ Triph. 437 Τροίης ὑπὸ τείχεσσι. Its
frequency in Q. could be accounted for by the high incidence of the clausula
moenia Troiae (cf. Stat. Silv. 4.4.104 circa m.T./; epithet preceding: V. Fl. 4.58),
though no passage in Q. has an obvious point of contact with any of the
numerous Latin examples.

2
αἰχμηταὶ Δαναοί (cf. iii.3): a solitary reproduction of M 419 (2...; τεῖχος
418 ~ τείχεος 420), also a stalemate situation. vii.112 Δαναῶν στρατὸν
αἰχμητῶν/ blends Θ 33, 464 with Θ 472. Δαναοί: 157n. πολέμου...
τέκμωρ is based on Π 302 and (Δαναῶν, π...) P 761 πολέμου εἶς γίνεται ἔρωή/,
a hemistich imitated by Theoc. (22.192 μάχης εἶς γίνεται ἔρωή/) and by Q.
himself again at ix.15 ἀποφθινύθωναι, κακῶ εἶς γίνεται ἔρωή/ with help
from Hes. Th. 876 φθείρονται, κακῶ εἶς γίνεται ἄλκη/. — The clausula (—)
ετο τέκμωρ is Homeric (N 20 Π 472), but the expression πολ. τέκμωρ is
exclusive to Q. (cf. iii.503, xii.224-5, 258): it was suggested perhaps by τέλος
πολέμου (438n.), τέλος being a common gloss on τέκμωρ in antiquity, cf.
Henrichs, ~~ZPE~~ 7, 1971, 240f.; a more specific 'way out of' = μήχος (cf. 22
below; see § 373 ~ B 343 with H. Frankel, Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy,
Oxford 1975, 164.13) would be appropriate here and at iii.503, xii.224-5, but
hardly at xii.258. γίνετο: this orthography was contemptuously rejected
for Homer by La Roche, 219-20 (cf. too Chantraine, 1.12f.), but it is the vulgate
Homer and is to be read everywhere in Q. (Vian, Rech. 166). See West on Hes.
Th. 429, 876.

3-7

Q. here (as at vi.5f.) reflects something of the leisurely pace normally
encountered in assembly-scenes in Homer (see Arend 119f.); he dispenses with

the preliminaries at xiv.234.

3

δη τότε ἀριτετήνων: Certamen 127(—ῆες) cf. A.R.4.1288. ἄγυριν ποιήματα: a pretentious, indeed inaccurate (cf. Doederlein 1.44; Lex fr Ep s. ἄγυρις) variation on Homer's ἀγορήν π. (Θ 2,489, cf. A.R.3.576). For the relatively rare ἄγυρις see LSJ, adding Eudoc. Cypr. 255.

3-4

Κάλαχας/εὖ εἰδώς = Triph. 172-3.

4-7

When a character in Homer is about to make a decisive contribution to the proceedings (particularly in the context of an assembly) he is more often than not accorded a set description, regardless of whether or not we have met him already: A (54f. assembly convened ~) 69f. (Calchas: cf. ἡ δὲ, ἣν δὲ μαντοσύνην τὴν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, ὃ σφιν .. ἀγορήεατο καὶ μετέειπεν); O 281f. (ἔπειτ' ἀγόρευε Θόας ἐπιτάμενος κτλ.); Σ 249f.; β 157f. (Halitherses the seer; ὄρνιθας γινῶναι ...; a truncated version of the same in ω 451f.); η 155f. (... εἰδώς); π 394f. Cf. Virg. A. 5.704f. (seer Nantes), 11.336f.; V. Fl. 1.228f. (seer Idmon); and the superb parody of this epic mannerism (along with a host of others) in Claud. Eutr. 2.376f.

4

Homer's Calchas εὖ εἰδώς ἀγόρευε θεοπροπίας ἑκάτοια A 385, used also in ii.166 and xiv.365). εὖ εἰδώς/ἀνὰ θυμόν: both components of this unit are Homeric, and cf. B 409, [Hes.] F198.5 ἥδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμόν. Q. may be varying the key concepts of M 228-9; for θυμός, 'the organ of seership', see Dodds 26.99. ὕπ' ἐννεσίης: ἐννεσί' — 24 times in Q., 11 times with ὑπό. A.R. is the first to employ the preposition (1.7, al.); after him it is more commonly present than absent, particularly among Christian versifiers. Of the three archaic instances of ἐννεσί' — (E 894; Hes. ~~Th.~~ Th. 494; hDem. 30 Διὸς — ἡεῖ /) Q. imitates only the last (with variations: ii.508, iii.762, x.250; ctr. Ep. adesp. CA 1.6; orac. ap. Paus. 9.18.5 = Parke-Wormell 409.4; hymn ap. Hld. Aeth. 3.4.3.), but much of the residue can be paralleled in later verse: e.g.: infr. 148 (~ i.125, xi.285) = [Orph.] A 268; iii.475 (—ἡεῖν ὕπ') cf. [Apolin.] 111.2;

v.195,viii.432:cf. [Apolin.] 118.26, Anon.AP 9.788.2. — Apollo 'injects', 'implants'(cf.LSJ ἐνίημι I.2, and for the form W.F.Wyatt Jr., Metrical Lengthening in Homer, Rome 1969,94)specialised skills. The word(badly handled in lexica, and forced into two distinct categories by Fränkel, 283-4) bears a remarkable variety of nuances in late poetry.

5

πτήϊας οἰωνῶν : πτήϊεν οἰωνῶν occurs in a list of the departments of μαντική at A.Pr.488. This is the only other verse example of πτήϊας, and perhaps the immediate model; but the word is commonplace in prose discussions of οἰωνοσκοπία, e.g. Clem.Al. Strom. 1.16. ἄστέρων : Calchas is the οἰωνοσκοπός par excellence, and ἄστέρων is surprising; perhaps it would be less surprising if more imperial epic were available to us. Astrological divination¹¹ is alien to the Homeric world, where celestial τέρατα are kept out of the action¹², and to tragedy¹³. The only unequivocal examples in Greek verse appear to be: [Orph.] A.37, 207f. (but the former of Orpheus, not a full-time seer, cf. Kern Orphica 267; the latter of the pilot Ancaeus — the product of an unbalanced mind); Nonn. 6.58f. Astraeus, 38.31f. Idmon, both pieces of mystic nonsense. If we return to the sanity of the heroic world our attention must focus on Roman poets: for Calchas cf. Enn. Iph. 185f.; Sen. Tro. 345f. (list of mantic activities, including stella); in epic e.g. Virg. A. 3.359f. (Helenos; list, incl. sidera, cmina pennae), Stat. Theb. 8.177f. (Amphiaraus; list, incl. sidereos lapsus), — Ctr. Calchas in Prop. 4.1.109f.

5-6

ἄλλα τε πάντα /... ὅς : v 11-12 ἄλλα τε π. / δῶρ', ὅς, sim. iii.291-2 (ὅς), v.635-6 (δ' ἄλλοι). The unit ἄλλα τε π. / is found occasionally outside Homer (also M 285 Ψ 483) and Q. (also vi.52, xii.144): Arat. 622, A.R. 1.1209, 4.888, Triph. 688, [Orph.] F167(b)4. πάντα /... πέλονται : the phraseology owes much to Homer: I 591-2 ἄπαντα / κήδε', ὅς [ctr. ψ 110 / ἑλμαθ', ἄ... ἴδμεν] ἄνθρωποις πέλει ~ θ 160 [cf. A.R. 1.679] v 60 (οἱ δ' ἄτ', τὰ τ'...) ἄνθρωποις πέλονται; but the immediate model may

have been Arat.1036-7 ὅββα πέλονται/δήματ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους. For the combination δημαθ'...θεῶν ἰότητι of A.R.3.545.

6

θεῶν ἰότητι ('Will': the context determines whether benevolence or malevolence is meant. Leumann's speculations [127f.] are countered by Ernst Fränkel, Gnomon 23, 1951, 373): cf. ix.491 and, unusually, vii.638 ± υ θ. ἰότητι; once in Il.(T 9), 6 times in Od.(note λ 341 - ο 161 θεῶν ἰότητι κέονται/), quite often thereafter.

7

καί σφιν λυγρομένοισιν: the scribe of P (εἰ in ras.) perhaps considered λυγρομένοισιν more 'epic' and may have envisaged an original καί σφ 161ν λυρ — (cf. A.R.1.1105-6 v.l., Nonn.36, 429); for λυρ — cf. vi.8 and, closer still, Nonn. Met. 21.9 / καί σφιν λυγρομένοισι .. ἐννεπε. ἔπος κοτὶ τοῖον ἔειπε: peculiar to Q.(i.211 [λυγρομένοισιν..] +4), but the basic pattern is Alexandrine: A.R.4.738, 1097 ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τοῖον ἔειπεν/(cf. id. 2.144 corr., Campbell CQ n.s.19, 1969, 277); [Theoc.] 25.77 ἔπος δ' ὄγε τοῖον ἔειπεν /. The first certain examples (a poorly supported variant in ρ 100; wrongly conjectured in Bacch.5.160, cf. Führer op.cit. below on 551, p.90) of τοῖον / τοῖα, 'the following', in formal speech introductions are Alexandrine (previously τοῖαδε, τοιοῦτον). Common in Q.

8

Polite vocative formulations appear in the subsequent debate, Calchas here gets right to the point. παρ τείχεσσι = H 135. ἐφεζόμενοι πονέεσθε: excellently rendered by Vian: 'Cessez cette immobile guerre de siège'. Cf. (παρὰ τεῖχος) ἐζόμενοι at x.17 (~ H 100), and Λ 403.

9

Cf. κ 489-90 /μηκέτι ..., /ἀλλ' ἀλλήν ...; hHerm.348 /ἀλλ' ἀλλήν τινὰ μῆτιν ἔχων ...; X 174 /ἀλλ' ... μητιλάσθε/. For the clausula φρεσὶ μ. see 51n. In Homer Odysseus assembles his comrades (κ 188) and suggests: ἀλλὰ

()

φραζώμεθα θάλασσαν/εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις (192-3); in A.R. brain is more important than brawn, and appeals for μῆτις occur regularly: 1.653f.

(Lemniades in assembly); 2.1046f. (Amphidamas to Argonauts; 1049f. $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha' \tau\iota\nu'$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\nu / \mu\eta\tau\iota\nu \dots$), 1058; 2.1277f.; 3.167f.

9-10

$\mu\eta\tau\iota\nu \dots / \eta' \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\nu$: A.R. 3.720 $/ \eta' \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\nu \eta' \tau\iota\nu\alpha \mu\eta\tau\iota\nu$ (\sim Jo. Gaz. 1.80 $/ \mu\eta \delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\nu \eta' \tau\iota\nu\alpha \mu\eta\tau\iota\nu$) cf. id. 781. Koechly, feeling himself bound by infr. 20, 48, 226, changed η' to $\kappa\alpha\iota$. But Calchas is confronting $\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ and treads warily at first: it is only after reporting the portent, which sanctions the application of trickery, that he feels emboldened to specify $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$ (20), with $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ first. A dash should be printed after $\mu\eta\tau\iota\alpha\delta\epsilon$ in 9.

10

$\nu\eta\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \eta\mu\iota\nu$: 'the ships and us' (and, by implication, the Greek armament as a whole). Mention of the ships, so far from being 'peu opportune' (Vian, Rech. 159) is entirely natural, as they constituted the army's life-line and were just as vital to the Greeks as city-walls were to the Trojans (who were not defeated yet). On the importance of this theme in Il. see Schadewaldt, Iliasstudien 67. Cf., inter alia, 1423-4 ($\delta\phi\rho' \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\nu \phi\rho\alpha\iota\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota \epsilon\nu\iota \phi\rho\epsilon\delta\iota \mu\eta\tau\iota\nu \alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\iota / \eta' \kappa\epsilon \epsilon\phi\iota\nu \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \tau\epsilon \sigma\alpha\psi \kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\alpha\omicron\nu \alpha\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$), K 45, M 155-6, Ξ 56=68 ($\nu\eta\omega\nu \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\rho \epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota /$); vii. 142, 416, viii. 211. $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau' \delta\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota\alpha\rho$: Ep. adesp. CA 2.67, [Orph.] L. 343; cf. vi. 417 $\sigma\omicron\iota \epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau' \delta\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota\alpha\rho$, after X 485-6 $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega / \epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\epsilon\alpha\iota \dots \delta\acute{\nu}\epsilon\iota\alpha\rho \dots \omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon \sigma\omicron\iota$.

11

A fierce battle has been raging, and Calchas' portent has not been allowed to cut in on the action (cf. iv. 95 $/ \omega\varsigma \chi\theta\iota\varsigma\eta' \mu\omicron\iota \epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\upsilon \dots$, a conversation first heard of at that point). So in Stat. Theb. 10.198f. the seer Theiodamas claims to have seen a portent (equidem haec... Marte diurno... vidi), and that claim is followed by an attack involving dolus, wherein Capaneus, a less scrupulous counterpart of Q.'s Neoptolemos (cf. his defiance of Zeus' thunder in A. Th. 428f.), refuses to participate, ipse haud dignatus in hostem / ire dolo superosque sequi (10.258-9). $\eta' \gamma\alpha\rho \epsilon\acute{\gamma}\omega\upsilon\epsilon$ (\sim ii. 311 $\epsilon\acute{\gamma}\omega\upsilon\epsilon$): clausulaic elsewhere in hexameters: N 744 ($\dots \tau\omicron \chi\theta\iota\varsigma\omicron\nu$), Antip. Thess. GPh 673, Gr. Naz. 551.384; at the beginning of a pentam. in Thgn. IEG 780. $\chi\theta\iota\varsigma\omicron\nu$: adjectival

at ix.5 $\chi\theta\iota\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu \dots \tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma \dots \theta\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu$ /, here almost certainly adverbial, as at xiv.237 codd., where, however, Rhodemann's correction derives support from iv.95 (Vian*). $\chi\theta\iota\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu$ for $\chi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ may have been regarded as *recherché* prior to the imperial period: T 195 (Call. HE 1242 is adj., see the previous line, and A.R.4.1397 should be written $\epsilon\lambda\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ [not $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\iota$] $\pi\omicron\nu \chi\theta\iota\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu$ with Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax, Basel 1924, 2.194; not enough of Euph. CA 75 survives to reveal its grammatical status). Subsequent examples: Antip. Thess. GPh 268, Greg. Naz. 1453.17 [after Hom.], Colluth. 331, al., Maced. AP 11.61.1 and Metrod. 14.141.2; cf. the fragmentary 'Pampr.' GDK 35.1 r22; Anon. id. suppl. 10.27.

12-18

Hawk-dove portents occur in o 525f. (portending destruction of suitors); A.R.3.540f.; Sil.4.103f. (with a set description of a seer; on this episode see H. Juhnke, Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit, München 1972, 199f.); Nonn. cited in next note. There may be a remote point of contact with Neoptolemos (the 'sacker' of Troy [e.g. Pi. F104] and the most prominent butcher therein): he is compared to a $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ in E. Andr. 1140f., Antim. (?) F84.2. Homer's men in the Horse are described as $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota \phi\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\eta\rho\alpha \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ / (δ 273 θ 513), cf. *infr.* 18.

12

Asyndeton occurs regularly at the start of portent stories: cf. B 308 / $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha \theta\eta\mu\alpha' \delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\nu \dots$; A.R.4.1364-5; esp. Nonn. 42.535f. / $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha \theta\eta\mu\alpha \dots$ / $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma \dots \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\epsilon \pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha, \tau\eta\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon} \dots$ For the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ -series of 12-17 cf. e.g. Θ 247f., M 205f., β 152f.

13

Χηραμόν ἐς πέτρης: a detail from the main model, Φ 493-4 'Artemis fled before Hera $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\epsilon \pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha, \eta' \rho\acute{\alpha} \theta' \delta\pi' \acute{\iota}\rho\eta\kappa\omicron\varsigma \kappa\omicron\tau\lambda\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\tau\omicron \pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\varsigma$ / Χηραμόν '. For the expression cf. Ps.-Phoc. Sent. 172 $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\varsigma \kappa\omicron\tau\lambda\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \chi\eta\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$, A.R. (4.1298-9) has $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\varsigma (\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\eta\varsigma, ?) / \chi\eta\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$, cf. perhaps viii.42 (lacuna praeunte). Χηραμόν ... κατεδύατο: Χηραμός is glossed $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in schol. D Φ 495 and elsewhere, see Erbse ad loc. κατεδύατο codd., the predominant form in Q. (Vian, Rech. 165): -βeto Vian. See in general

Leumann, Glotta 32, 1953, 204f. = Kl. Schr. 234f. (bibl.); Erbse on schol. B 35a.

-6ετο was the form preferred by Aristarchus, though apparently he did not alter -6ατο wherever he found it (cf. schol. Γ 262a¹⁻²; Ludwig 2.123).

Ptolemaic papyri give -6ατο (-6ετο vulg.) at Ψ 212, φ 5 (West, FP 184, 278), the medieval tradition vacillates. A.R. among others allows both forms (van Krevelen, Mnemosyne 4.6, 1953, 63), and with Erbse (566) I should prefer to leave the transmitted text alone. — Vian* regards -6ετο as lectio difficilior.

τῇ δὲ χολωθεῖς: Rhodomann's τῇ δ' δ', accepted by

Zimmermann, involves an easy fault (microscopic o latched on to following

χ, subsequently disappears from view), and seems all but certain [Vian* agrees]

: note κείνη 12, ἡ and δ 15, ἡ 16, ε 17. One may compare

the sequence of S. Ph. 371f., δ ε' ... καὶ ὡς χολωθεῖς ... δ ε' ...

13-14

χολωθεῖς / ἀργαλέως: cf. 215-6n., and xiv. 309. ἀργαλέως, widespread in Q., is seldom found elsewhere: Thgn. IEG 1091, Man. 5.33, Anon. AP 9.499.1.

14

μάλα ... χρόνον: μ 407 (α' μ.), vii. 458, ix. 281. Cf. 59n. λγχο' θι

μύμνε: Hom. αὐτόθι μύμν- / (S 245 etc.), cf. i. 442 (ἐνδοθι); infr. 284n.

15

ἐνθήμενος δόλον: sc. φρεσίν (370n.), cf. Opp. Hal. 3.479 δόλον ἐν φρεσὶ

θέεθαι, of a fish. δόλον αἰνόν: Vian's correction (χόλον codd.) is clearly as vital here (despite X 94) as is that of Rhodomann at v. 457. Erbse's argument for the retention of χόλον [566] seems to me to amount to a mere paraphrase of an unsatisfactory text. The two words are often confused, e.g. λ 439, Hes. Th. 562, and note χολ- in 13. — For αἰνόν cf. infr. 392, xi. 62-3; the only example of this combination outside Q. (who uses αἰνός for most things) seems to be GVI 740.3 (Amnisos, ii-iii).

16

θάμνω ἐπεκρύφθη: cf. P 677 / θάμνω ὑπ'; and [Theoc.] 25.227 θάμνοισιν ... ἐκρύφθην / (S. El. 55). Similar in form is viii. 469, which goes against

Zen./vulg. at O 626. ἡ δ' ἐκθόρεν ἀφραδίῃσιν: p 233 ἐνθόρεν ἀφραδίῃσιν; one of the variants in Φ 18 δ δ' ἐκθόρε is ἐκθόρε. The Trojans in the event are ἀφραδέοντες (545).

17

Presumably a reworking, and a poor one, of iii.175 ἐλπομένη μιν εἴτ' ἔμμεν
 ἀνώντατον, ὅς δ' ὑπὸ πότμῳ: μιν thus postponed nowhere else in Q. ἐπασθεις:
 cf. ἄρθεῖς / N 63, of an ἔρηξ attacking his prey.

18

δειλαῖη τρήρωνι: Antip. Sid. HE 300 / δειλαί... πέλειαι /. δειλαῖος of
 animals (cf. iii.172) often in Babrius, e.g. 95.41, of a victim pursued by a
 lion ἐφορμήας. Q.'s portent reflects the limpidity of a Babrian fable.
τρήρωνι φόνον: cf. Or. Gr. 163(b) Hendess: (τρήρωνες) φρίσσει φονῆα /
 sc. κίρκον. φόνον δτονόεντ' ἐφέηκε: so (ἐφέηκα) v.185, viii.142,
 xiii.359. This unit, unique to Q. (who found the epithet δτονόεις irresist-
 ible, 63n.) has the status of a 'formula' which displays variation of terminal
 verb: τίθησιν, φέροντα-σαι, βαλέσθαι (3x), νόησε. The rigidity of the
 pattern is breached only twice: v.510, vi.405.

19

τῷ νῦν μὴ: L 568 χ 251, cf. infr. 70. βίη περιμέθεα: suggested perhaps
 by M 341. Τρώιον: in Q. also with ἵπποι (i.351, =Trojan); οὐδ' ας
 (6x, cf. Colluth. 210, and Ov. Trist. 2.404, 5.14.40; Ep. 13.94); πεδίον (vi.428,
 see below); νῆες (45n.). See next note. Τρώιον ἄγτυ =xiv.9; ποτὶ Τ.
 i.52, iii.339, xii.421. The same phrase in Triph. 174, Colluth. 141. I suspect
 that it is a creation of the late Alexandrine or imperial epoch. Τρώιος
 in Homer never (unlike Τρωικός) refers to what belongs to all the Trojans
 (P. Chantraine, Études sur le vocabulaire grec, Paris 1956, 105). Early
 poets appear to respect the distinction: E. Alexandr. F43.42 Snell ἄγτυ ...
 Τρωικόν ~ S. Ph. 1423-4 τὸ Τρωικόν / πόλις μὲν; S. Aj. 862-3 τὰ Τρωικά / πεδία
 cf. K 11 ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρωικόν, Ψ 464 / Τρωικὸν ἄμ πεδίον, 'Simon. 'EpGr.
 225 Page Τρωικὸν ἐς [v.l. ἄμ] πεδίον /, and: Pi. F172.4 Τρώων ἄμ πεδίον:
 Τρώιον Boeckh, edd., read Τρωικόν (ctr. v. vi.428 / Τρώιον ἄμ πεδίον).
 [At E. El. 440 Τρώϊας, if right, will be gen. sing.; E. Andr. 305 is a hopeless
 muddle]. The practice of later poets is different, e.g.: Antiph. GPh 925-6
 τεῖχος .. / Τρώιον (E. Or. 246 Τρωικῶν .. τειχέων); Bass. id. 1615 πύργος
 ὁ Τρώϊος (E. Tr. 720 πύργων ... Τρωικῶν); Triph. 531-2 Τρώιον .. / λαόν

(Hom. Τρωϊκόν). — The earliest example of the type -ισ (ethn.) ῥέτυ is, according to Pfeiffer on Call. F75.74, Phryn. Trag. F9.1 Snell; other contenders are Simon. (?) IEG 10.3; Bacch. 11.57 (cf. Robertson, CR n.s. 1, 1951, 16). It is widespread in later verse.

19-20

Τρωϊον ῥέτυ / περέμεν : cf. B 660 / πέρως ῥέτεα ; xiv.9 πέρωατες... Τρωϊον ῥέτυ / ; Antim. (Theb.) F28.2 διεπέρωατε Δύμιον ῥέτυ / (for Wyss' citation of Q. there consult Vian's app. crit. ad loc.). The closest Homer comes to this expression is Φ 584 (cf. ix. 279-80).

20

εἰ : i.e. περῶμεθα εἰ, a common locution from Homer on. δόλους καὶ μῆτις : in reverse order infr. 48. Q. breaks away from the Homeric prototype, ε 422 δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὑφ' αἰνῶν /, unlike [Orph.] A. 842, Nonn. 37.316.

21-65

Odysseus suggests a trick, and Calchas lends his support.

Q. allies himself with the most popular account: the Horse is the brain-child of Odysseus. He devised the Horse (Polyaen. Strat. 1, proem. 9, Philostr. Her. 11.4-5, Lib. Enc. 8p. 231 and Eth. 8p. 433; one is surprised to find no mention of this in the list of Odysseus' achievements in Sid. Carm. 9.151f.), and either suggested that Epeius should build it ([Apollod.] 5.14; implied in Pl. Bac. 940 Ulixes, quouiis consilio haec gerunt ~ Epius 937) or issued a general command that was taken up by Epeius (Tz. Posth. 631f., perhaps an abridgement of a debate akin to the Sinon-story in Q.). The ascription of the scheme to Odysseus will go back to the archaic period: but Homer (θ 494-5) is imprecise (Odysseus however clearly masterminds the whole operation¹⁴); the bald summary of Il. Parv. (222f.: καὶ ῥεπιδὸς κατ' Ἀθηνᾶς προαίρειν τὸν δούρεον ἵππον κατασκευάσει) is unhelpful; of Il. Pers. we know nothing¹⁵; on Stesichorus see below on 83; 218-259.

Laocoon in Virg. A. 2.44 automatically assumes that the Horse is due to Odysseus. The sequence of ideas there suggests a tragic source: sic notus Ulixes?.... timeo Danaos ... invites comparison with Hector's words

in Rhesus 861f.: 'What Greek other than Odysseus would have perpetrated or planned such deeds? δέδοικα δ' αὐτόν ...' (cf. id. 704f., 952f., where anything smelling of deceit is attributed without hesitation to Odysseus).

The present speech substantially prefigures the exhortation of 220f., but here Odysseus does not say why the Trojans will actually be prepared to take in the Horse (ctr. 237). And nobody in the world of the Heroic Digest thinks to ask now. The bare and bland 'let us construct a Horse' (28) is all right if you know the story already.

21

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη followed by δέ B 265 etc., and of course often in Q. φρεσὶ
τεκμήρασθαι : Opp. Hal. 5.123 (τοῦ δ' ... ἐνὶ) φρεσὶ τεκμαίρονται/.

22

ἄλκαρ οἰσυροῦ μόθου : variations in i.160, ii.11. Cf. [Orph.] L.3 οἰσύρος
.. ἄλκαρ /, and for οἰσ. μ. Γ 112 (πολέμοιο); xi.498 (δηγίς); infr.
87 (δεμίνης). μόθου : regularly in Q. a neutral word for 'war', 'fray',
as in H 117, cf. Trumphy 158. δίσοντο : again iv.16, vii.26, 258, x.447. An
idea of the spread of this verb may be gained from Livrea's note on Colluth.
80.

22-3

μήχος / ἐρέμεκα : from B 342-3 = μ 392-3, cf. the similar pattern of ii.74-
5, x.11-12, and / 249-50. The phrase is rare outside epic: Theoc. 2.95, Gr. Naz.
1231.51 (both with verb first).

23

μόυνος δέ ... : for 'but only' after 'all' cf, e.g. Nonn. 32.281-2, 38.30f., and
μόυνος δ' in A.R. 3. (555-) 556. One might have expected here an ὅψ' ἔδ' -
routine, for which see Bühler, Mosch. Eur. pp. 64f. καοφροδύνῃσι : Homeric
δὲ λεγ. (ψ 13 sing.; ψ 30 plur. ~ iii.426 [sing.]). The sing. is wide-
spread in post-Homeric verse, the plur. (also vii.47, xiii.180) extremely rare:
GVI 1726.5 (Pisidia, 'vor 212 n. Chr. '); Opp. Hal. 3.359; 'Pampr. 'GDK 35.1r16. For
Odysseus' sagacity cf. Lib. Enc. 2.14: 'people say τὴν ἐκείνου σοφίαν ἐμπλήσαι
τὸν ἴππον τῶν ἀρίστων ἀνδρῶν'.

24

υἱὸς Λαέρταο: χ 191; iv. 592 δαΐφρονος ~ θ 18 / υἱὸν Λ. δαΐφρονα; v. 129 (καὶ ...); v. 238 ~ [Hes.] F198.3; vii. 404 πύκα φρονέων = infr. 219. καὶ ... μῦθον: for the pattern cf. Φ 393al. καὶ .. φάτο μῦθον, and Zen.'s reading at Z54: καὶ ἀντίον ἔπος ἦν δα / . The chief model here is A.R. 3.565 ὧς ἄρ' ἄρα τίς οἱ ἐναντίον ἔκφατο μῦθον / . He and Q. are the only ones to employ the unit ἔκφατο μῦθα(ν /): clausulaic 4 times in Q. (cf. infr. 552 with A.R. 4.410), infr. 205+3 the run / τοῖον δ' ἔκφατο μῦθον after A.R. 2.10, al.

25

Apparently the sole epic instance of the address 'o you who are honoured' familiar from tragedy, e.g. S. OT 1223 ὦ ... τιμώμενοι. Seneca's Oedipus addresses Teiresias with the words sacrate divis (Oed. 291). ὦ φίλ': γ 103 and often thereafter. ἐπουρανίοισι ... θεοῖσιν: cf. Z527; Z129, 131. τετιμένε .. θεοῖσιν: [Orph.] H. 45.5, 54.2 τετιμένε πάρι θεοῖσιν / (cf. PMG 880), after Λ 533 θεοῖσιν τετιμένος. Variants of this expression: (ἀθανάτοισι appended to θ.) Hes. Th. 415, GVI 1843.5 (= IME 68), i-ii; (ἀθαν. alone) iii. 116, reversing the order of hAphr. 205, sim. hDem. 397, Certamen 220.

26

εἰ ἔτεόν: cf. viii. 475, xiii. 513; and iii. 190, iv. 83, 103 / ὦ φίλοι (ξ - ορ), εἰ ἔτεόν ...; the incipit εἰ ἔτεόν (without δῆ, γε) also B300 v. 1., ω 352, A.R. 2.325, Gr. Naz. 669.21, 1262.15, Nonn. D. 3.160 + 5. Exactly as in A.R. 3.549 (Mopsos' reaction to an omen), 'das... εἰ ἔτεόν drückt..keinen echten Zweifel aus' (Fränkel 359.39). ἐυπτολέμοισιν Ἀχαιοῖς = xi. 150, cf. infr. 218 ~ vi. 301. ἐυπ(τ)όλεμος, alien to early epic so far as we know, makes a brief appearance in classical epitaphs (GVI 20.4, Athens 432 and 1564.2, Athens v), is unknown in Alexandrine verse, but reemerges subsequently: to the examples in LSJ ἐυπτολ-πτολ- may be added Nonn. 5.98, Paul. Sil. Ecphr. 967, 971, and the attractive conjecture of Unger at Colluth. 150. Q. himself uses the word for a number of repetitive noun-epithet combinations (cf. on 52 below). It replaces the Homeric φίλοπτολ- where metre demands an initial

vowel(e.g. ε-ου Ἀχιλλῆος/ 5x ~ φ-ου Ἀχι/ 3x; ε-ων Ἀργεῶν/ 1x ~ φ-ων Ἀργ./ 2x), but it is interchangeable with φιλ- in the sequences Τρωέεεε, Τρωεὶ φιλ- ~ Τρωέεεειν, Τρωεῖν εὔ- (see e.g. v.174 against viii.240); cf. 50n. — The epithet is studiously chosen: as we shall see, for Odysseus trickery (see the next line) is in no way incompatible with prowess.

27

ἐκπερβαί Πριάμοιο .. πόλιν : A19 / ἐκπερβαί Πριάμοιο πόλιν. Further mutations: iii.652-3, xi.288. δολοφροσύνη: again vii.275 (sing.), v.210, 645 (plur.). One of a galaxy of words uncommon in archaic epic but done to death by later versifiers: sing.: - T 112, hHerm. 361 → Norm. 20.290, 48.685, [Apolin.] 34.43, Colluth. 321; plur.: - T 97 → A.R. 4.687, Opp. Hal. 3.156, [Apolin.] 63.10, Colluth. 369, Christod. 175.

28

ἵππον τεκτῆνδντες : cf. 81, 378. ἄριστες... ἄνδρες : see 71 and n. ἄριτ- ἄν, first A.R. 1.70 +4, then Colluth. 272; the reverse, Homeric order, represented in i.164 / ἄνδρες ἄριστης, is marginally commoner: O 489 +3 / ἄνδρὸς - ἦος = A.R. CA 12.17, GVI 670.2 (pentam.; Mysia, ii-iii); § 218 / ἄνδρας - ἦας ; E. IA 28 (conj. id. Med. 5); Mnasaloc. HE 2625. — For the commonplace association of ἄριστης / ἄριστοι with a λόχος cf. e.g. § 217-8 (ἄνδρας ἄριστης); N 276-7 (ἐς λόχον); θ 512 (ἵππον ὁθ' ἦεντο πάντες ἄριστοι /); Il. Parv. 230f.; Triph. 308, 382; infr. 234, 268-9, 344.

28-9

ἐς λόχον .. / βησόμεθ' : echoed in 279-80 infr.

29

ἄεπαςίως : 'gladly', a wry detail from Odysseus: he is determined that he will meet with no opposition.

29-31

ἄοι κλισίᾱς : the text has been badly mauled at 30-1, πάντα εἰς κλισίην ; εἰς from 30 and 32 init., an error which has extended to 337 infr., εἰς κλισίην perhaps from / 90 etc. Available parallels support Koechly rather than West's ingenious ἄοις, πάντα, ἦν κλισίην : (a) nom. ἄοι :

ε 350 κ 528(f.) αὐτὸς δ' ἄπονός φηι τραπέθει / [imit. [Orph.] L.739];
 (b) plur. κλίβας : infr. 337; Nonn. 36.145 κλίβας ἐμπρήβατε; cf. also Triph.
 215.

30

εἰς Τένεδον: γ 159. This and other details in Odysseus' speech will be
 dealt with when his suggestions are translated into actuality. εὐν
νηυσίν = Σ 213 etc. Cf. B 236a1. εὐν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα.

31

ἄπ' ἔγχεος: ii.98 (Τρῶες /.. ἐβκοπίαν ἄπ') and often. This
 unit, unknown to early epic, occurs in [Theoc.] 25.56, GVI 1192.1 (Thrace,
 ii-iii), [Opp.] Cyn. 1.487, Nonn. D. 18.324 and Met. 7.95, 11.63.

32

εἰς πειλὸν προχέωνται: B 465 (—οντο) = Nonn. 22.145 and (πρ. κατηφέες)
 34.129. The same phrase is used to describe the Trojan's egress by Triph.
 (239, claus.). ἄταρ βέες: this hapax Hom. (N 299 κρατερὸς καὶ —ῆς / ~
 iv.274 κρατεροὶ καὶ —έες) is popular with Q., who has it most often in
 noun-epithet combinations (74n.). For its predicative use cf. iv.238; vi.
 116 (Τρῶες); x.57 (cf. N 299 again) ἄ. ἄμφ — ~ infr. 64.

32-3

ἄνῃρ / θαλασσεύς: η 51 —έος .. ἄνῃρ; cf. Diosc. HE 1545-6, Opp. Hal. 5.395,
 Christod. 232.

33

Cf. (Vian) Arat. 64 τὸ μὲν οὐτίς ἐπίσταται (after E 665); E 9 K 314 / ἤν
 δεῖ τις ἐν Τρώεσσι ... — τὸν δ' of YD might be retained if τὸν ...
 Τρώεσσι could be held to constitute a parenthesis (ἐπίσταται vividly
 'know' = 'is going to know'), but the correction τ' (or ρ'?) is preferable:
 cf. infr. 238. δ' may have been prompted (if any prompting was needed) by
 τ 87 / Τηλέμαχος τὸν δ' οὐτίς ἐνὶ ...

34

μυμνέτω .. ἴππου: Nonn. 39.118-9 / ἐκτοθεν ... κυδοιμὸν / μυμνέτω ..
 ὀραδύς (v.33 supr.). For ἴππου see Vian, tome ii, p.211. ἄρῃον ..
κῆρ: cf. 239 infr., viii.283-4 σπέρβιον ἐνδέμενοι κῆρ / μίμνον; x.291 ~

| 639. ἀρηΐον κῆρ here only.

35-6

In like vein Triph.285(Priam to Sinon) ἔφυγες .. ἀνάρσειον ἄβριν Ἀχαιῶν /.

35

βίην σπερόπλαν: in xiv.550 followed by a participle, as in all the other instances of this phrase: Hes.Th.670 and F43(a)59 ~ Mimn.IEG9.3; [Theoc.] 25.152.

36

ῥέξαι ὑπέρ: A443-4 ἐκατόμβην / ῥέξαι ὑπὲρ Δαναῶν. λιταιομένων
μιν ἀλύξαι: a similar clausula in vi.387. Castiglioni's ὑπαλύξαι (p.50), accepted by Vian, introduces a verb used by Sinon at 251,383, and cf. Scut. 304 ῥέμενοι ὑπαλύξαι /; once the preverb had vanished an incompetent would have inserted μιν to plug up the gap. Just as easy, and not, I suspect, too clumsy for Q. would be Zimmermann's μέγ' ἀλύξαι: cf. i.214, ii.283, iv.36, vii.489 etc,

37

Τὸν ῥ' ἐκάλοντο: how Erbse(566) can argue, given infr.379, that Q. is here lapsing into direct speech (so codd., δ') I do not know. Vian's ῥ' is certain: cf. E 735 Θ 386; A.R.2.718; epigr. ap. Cougny, Abb. Anth. 191.2, p. 323. ἐκάλοντο: λ 523 ἵππον .. δ' ἄν κάμ' ἔπειος /, cf. infr.111 and Triph.99.

38

Τρώων ὑπὲρ ἀϊχμητῶν: our only echo of an isolated Homericism, A152 Τρώων ἔνεκ' .. ἀϊχ. /.

39

καὶ ... ὦ: a frequent sequence in Q., particularly in the formula ... ῥήματα(ν), after Φ 64 etc. ἐπὶ δ' ἡρόν: only in this sedes in Q. (iii. 524, iv.348, vi.18) as in v.l. ant. P 41; [v.l. β 285]; A.R.1.870, 2.517, 3.950; Mosch. Eur. 18; Doroth. Cat. Cod. Astr. 6.325; Triph.246. Internally in other sedes: | 415 ~ Eudoc. Cyp. 2.338; A.R.1.615 ~ Procl. H. 4.11. It is most commonly clausulaic: A.R.2.757, [Orph.] F288(c)I4 (=Ammon 4), Gr. Naz. AP 8.46.3; λ 113' ἐπὶ: Doroth. Cat. Cod. Astr. 6.328, Paul. Sil. AP 7.609.3 [Viansino 9; =GVI273];

οὐδ' ἐπὶ : A.R. 1.1072, Musae. 291, Max. 378; οὐκ ἐπὶ : A.R. 3.1049, Or. Sib. 13.27, 14.336, Gr. Naz. 1395.21, 1517.153. πιφάσκειν : πιφάσκ-PQ, ix.226 πιφάσκων P⁵¹ : πιφάσκ-PH. -άσκ- (the reading of codd. in [Orph.] L.763: πιφάσκ - Hermann) is a frequent v.l., e.g.: Hom. often; Hes. Th. 655, where see West; A. Pers. 662; A.R.: see Vian, Bude' i, p. lxxvi; D.P. 173; Opp. Hal. 2.213 (cf. Thompson, CQ n.s. 21, 1971, 511); [Orph.] A. 10; Nonn. Met. 18.161; [Apolin.] proem. 9.

40

λταρτηροί περ εόντες : cf. iv.223; 'brutal', 'cruel and unyielding', see Lex fr Ep s.v., Gow on Theoc. 22.28. Q. has this Homeric ῥῖς λει, 12 times (adv. - ὤσ vi.360, not recorded in LSJ; not a hapax [Vian Rech. 195], cf. Eudoc. Cyp. 1.1), notably in recurrent noun-epithet combinations (πάλαιος 2x; κυδοιμού 4x).

41

Sinon is the 'beggar Odysseus' (see n. on 360-88, § 2(b)): ρ 10 / τὸν ξείνον δύστηνον ἄγ' ἐς πόλιν (cf. γ 323, ρ 201); τ 253 εὖν ἐλεεινός /. ἐς δὲ πόλιν : hAp. 477 / ἐς τε π. θωῶν : that is, after he had convinced them (40). Odysseus only hints at what a volunteer might expect both here and infr. 239. Sinon in the event has no illusions.

42

ἀλεγεινὸν .. ἄρεα : cf. viii.239, from N⁵⁶⁸⁻⁹ (a warrior wounded) εἴδα μάλιστ' / γίνετ' ἄρης ἀλεγεινὸς οἱ σφοδρῶς βροτοῖσιν — a vigorous turn of phrase dampened down by Q. as by most moderns (cf. Cauer 352).

ἄρεα : this form is no stranger to hexameters, cf. e.g. A.R. 1.1024; GVI 102.3 (iii-ii; ἐς ἄρεα); Anon. P. Oxy. 2818.11; Nonn. D. see Peek; Anon. encom. GIK S 10.7; Colluth. 58. πέληται : πέληται codd. is probably a mere mechanical error (cf. A. Eu. 431 v.l.; at i.457 only R preserves the correct πένονται) rather than a learned importation of Zen.'s reading at μ 15 ἦν σῆμα πέλοιτο / (for which cf. Opp. Hal. 5.124, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.506).

43

Sinon carries out this instruction at xiii.23, ὅτ' ἐπὶ ἄρ' ἀποδιδόντα Σίῃν ἀνὰ πυρρὸν ἄειρε. For the language cf. (a) orac. in Porph. ap. Eus. PE 6.3 (Parke-Wormell 470.9) / ἀποδιδόντας ... πυρρὸν /; (b) A.R. 4.1552 ἀνὰ

βωλον αείρας/(after X³⁹⁹);xiii.446 δουρὶ δὲ καὶ πινυ αείρας/(c)Gr.Naz.
1576.325,Nonn.6.46 πυρρὸν αείρας/,cf.id.4.240 and earlier A.R.4.482-3,
Lyc.1295.

44

ἐποτρύνας:see xiii.35f. εὐρέος is no doubt a traditional epithet of
the Horse,cf.infr.283,566,584;Triph.104.

45

Τρώιοι υἱες :used by Q. alone:-(a)In this sedes,cf.infr.64 +10x. Most
adopt a rigid pattern,/ὥτ' ἄρα Τ. υἱες 5x,/καὶ τότε ,/δὴ τότε,/μή ποτε
once apiece;(b)Claus.,infr.482 +9x(δ' ἄλλοι Τ. υἱες twice, αὐτοὶ once). Hom.
Τρώων υἱες. ἀκηφέες :this word assumes an even more sinister tone at
infr.574.

46

The statement that Odysseus' plan of campaign met with universal approbation
flies in the face of Neoptolemos' protests of 66f.:he is against trickery,
and we can hardly be meant to imagine that he has had a change of heart
in the course of Calchas' back-up speech,or that he was initially impressed
but was incensed by the assertion that the Trojans could be καὶ τῶν (62).
The motif of Neoptolemos' opposition has been foisted in as an afterthought
without the required patching-up of the surrounding context(see the note
on 1-2,fin.). [A.R.3.555-6(see 23n.)is much easier]. ὥτ' ... ἐπήνεον:
after Ψ 539 etc.(= [Orph.] A.293) /ὥτ' ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπήνεον,
ἔζοχα δ' ἄλλων:i.814,ii.106;first in A.R.(1.858),then Nonn.D.8.334 +4,
[Apolin.] proem.53(ἐδέρβεεν),Jo.Gaz.1.239,2.270.

47

ἔπειτα :LSJ δανμῶσα,c;Kühner-Gerth 2.2.370Anm.2. Cf.infr.149. ὑπεθήκατ':
Y's offering presumably arose from a dittography(καθ-κατ').

47-8

ὑπεθήκατ'.... ὅς :reminiscent of Θ₃₆(=467) βουλήν δ' Ἀργείοις ἐποθησόμεθ'
ἥ τις δυνήσει(≈ 28 /ὥτ' ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἄρα πάντες...)and Hes.Th.175(Earth
to Cronus,set 20χψ 174) δόλον δ' ὑπεθήκατο πάντα/.

48

μήτιν καὶ δόλον:20n. δόλον ἐβόλον:perhaps suggested by Antiph.GPh

1002 δόλος .. ἐβλοῖστος, of the Horse; but Q. allows words denoting 'good' to run riot in his verses, cf. on 49. ἐβλοῖστος, δὲ Ἀργείοισιν is based on the Homeric runs ἐβλοῖστος, δὲ Ἀργείοισιν (T122), πατέρ' ἐβλοῖστος, δὲ ... (T395). ἔμελλε : 'was going to' as a matter of ^{certainty} necessity: Vian's 'promet' is too weak. On the use of μελλεῖν in Q. see Duckworth 60.

49

ἔμμεναι ἄλκῃ: ἄλκῃ here = 'help towards', 'means of securing', normally 'help against', 'help in averting', ἔμμεναι ἄλκῃ elsewhere closes the verse, i.160, xi.452 conj., A.R.2.1074, suppl. Dion. Bass. F20v11, [Apolin.] 132.9 (ctr. [Opp.] Cyn.4.153). Homer has ἄλκῃ ἐβέεσθαι / (E 644); ἄλκῃ .. ἐβέεσθαι (Λ 823-4 cf. Nic. Ther. 698-9), which Q. reverses at ii.11 ἐβέεσθαι ἄλκῃ (= [claus.] Or. Gr. 169.3 Hendess; Opp. Hal. 5.385 ἐβέεσθαι .. ἄλκῃ /). ἄλκῃ ... πῆμα: the Homeric models (see also 256n.) are Θ 175-6 (Hector loq.) 'Zeus has granted me νίκην καὶ μέγα κῆδος, ἄλκῃ Δαναοῖσι γε πῆμα', Z 282-3, Paris reared by Zeus μέγα ... πῆμα / Τρωεῖ (sim. X 421-2), and these are used again at i.650, ii.360 (in reverse), x.392. Despite Vian, Rech. 248, Hermann's conjecture (Orphica 820), adopted by Zimmermann, Τρωεῖν μέγα πῆμα (Τρωεῖν was misplaced, and a crude attempt was made to forge a pattern - υυ) seems to me to be compelling: Τρωεῖ is found nowhere else in Q., and cf. x.392 Τρωεῖ ... μέγα πῆμα / . [Vian* however points out that Q. is fond of -εῖ endings (Koechly Proleg. p. lii), and that Τρωεῖν is normally scanned -υ (ctr. xii.60); for μέγα ... πῆμα he compares iv.486; xii.585].

μέγα ... πῆμα: this Homeric combination (cf. below 545, 595) is found 17 times in Q., cf. Bissinger 168-9, who elsewhere (346) points out that μέγας occurs most often, relatively and absolutely, in this poem (note e.g. a run of three at 252-4; of two 265-6), and that the range of usages is not as wide as it might be. It is regrettable that Bissinger deliberately excluded from consideration (among others) the Christian versifiers who furnish a relatively large quantity of late poetry. There is a high incidence of μέγας in, e.g., some stretches of Or. Sib. and in Gr. Naz., and it is worth considering how far Q. was a man of his times. Other equally colourless

epithets(e.g. ἐβλίψι, εὐς, ἡύς, ἀπειρέσιος)flood the verse of this epoch.

50

εὐπτολέμοι μετηύδα:ctr. T₂₆₉ Ψ₅ -σι φιλοπτολέμοι μετηύδα/(see 26n.). For -σιν εὐ(υ)οί μετ./cf. X₄₄₉ ∫ 238;for -εεβι(υ-υυ)οί μετ./ θ 96al.

51

μηκέτι νῦν:xiv.166;often in Homer,and cf.A.R.4.190(... φίλοι),856,Argentarius GPh 1411,Dion.Bass.F19v22. δῶλον... μητιάεθε:Calchas is now prepared with Odysseus' backing to press unequivocally for δῶλος,which is now intimately fused with μήτις;cf.10n. For the language cf.:(a)(i) κ 380,Nonn.D.35.313(/μηδὲ .. δῶλον ἄλλον ἐπεντύνης)+3 δῶλον ἄλλον;(ii) β 93 ω 128 δῶλον τόνδ' ἄλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμήριζε /,hHerm.66 δῶλον (αἰπὺν) ἐνὶ φρεσίν. (b)(i)xi.62 δῶλον.. μητιάεθαί/A.R.4.7(Livrea ad loc.) δῶλον .. ἐπὶ φίλοι μητιάεκεν/[Apolin.] 11.4 δῶλον φρεσὶ μητιόωντες/;(ii)iii.655,ix.11 φρεσὶ μητιόωσα(-ωντα)/;supr.,9.

52

ὦ φίλοι: B 79etc.,ii.10etc, Common everywhere. ἄλλὰ πῖθεοθε: A₂₇₄ (/ἄλλῃ), λ 345(π./;ὦ φίλοι 344). εὐπτολέμω Ὀδυσῆϊ=v.320. For hiatus after πῖθεοθε cf.ii.59,v.152;Vian,Rech.215. West conjectured φιλοπτολέμω(εὐπτολ-50 above),which Erbse(564)supports,suggesting as an alternative μενεπτολ-[ism Tychsen];for φίλο-cf.v.158,and viii.258 -εεθε φίλο-. Elimination of unimaginative repetition is in general pointless,see below on 521-2. Determination to eradicate such tendencies can lead to gruesome results:Pauw,a worse poet than Q.,suggested e.g. ὄλως for θούγ 41; καὶ τὰχ' ἔπειτα in 139.

53,54,56

Successive γάρ clauses are not uncommon in epic:cf.my note ap.Vian,REA 75,1973,87.10.

53

οὐ ... ἀπρηκτον:abridgement of γάρ before οἱ is not all that uncommon (e.g. [Orph.] A.868;yet cf.the pap. reading at Scut.15,previously conjectured by Hermann;see too West on Hes.Op.526),but this coupled with the

shortening of the initial syllable of $\lambda' \pi \rho \eta \kappa \tau \omicron \nu$, which is unique in Q. and is highly unusual (cf. La Roche, HU 1.9, 32) led to a number of attempts to emend the line (Vian, Rech. 155.1), none of which looks convincing. Deletion of the copula (cf. ϵ 113, but sc. $\epsilon \sigma \tau \acute{\iota}$) seems precluded by the following $\eta' \delta \eta$ (54); Homer at any rate offers no real parallel, cf. C. Guiraud, La phrase nominale en grec ..., Paris 1962, 323f.; and in favour of its retention is Opp. Hal. 2.300 $\lambda' \pi \rho \eta \kappa \tau \omicron \nu \delta \epsilon \pi \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \kappa \epsilon \acute{\iota} \nu \omicron \iota \omicron \nu \omicron \eta \mu \alpha \iota$. $\epsilon \upsilon \phi \rho \omicron \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omicron \nu \tau \iota$: of sharpness of intellect, cf. infr. 287n., and v. 253f., where Odysseus boasts that he was picked for a dangerous mission ($\mu \acute{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \epsilon \rho \gamma \omicron \nu$ 255) because he was $\epsilon \upsilon \phi \rho \omicron \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omicron \nu$. At 244-5 infr. identical terminology is applied to Sinon, less appropriately: we are witnessing there a vestige of the Odysseus-Sinon character-duplication. $\epsilon \upsilon \phi \rho \omicron \nu \acute{\epsilon} \omicron \nu \tau \iota \nu \omicron \eta \mu \alpha$: \cup 82 $\epsilon \upsilon \phi \rho \alpha \iota \nu \omicron \iota \mu \iota$ v. 1.

54

Cf. A 456 ($\epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \delta \omega \rho$ 455) / $\eta' \delta \eta \nu \upsilon \nu \Delta \alpha \nu \alpha \omicron \iota \acute{\epsilon} \iota \nu$; v 40 $\eta' \delta \eta \gamma \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \lambda'$ $\mu \omicron \iota \phi \acute{\iota} \lambda \omicron \varsigma \eta' \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \theta \upsilon \mu \omicron \varsigma$; xiv. 310 / $\eta' \delta \eta \gamma \alpha \rho \dots \tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \beta \beta \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu$. $\theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ = ψ 286, A.R. 1.488, vii.9. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \delta \omega \rho$: cf. vii.482, viii.213 $\theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \epsilon \kappa \omicron \nu \epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \delta \omega \rho$ /, xiii.527 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \epsilon \acute{\epsilon}$ / . A similar clausula in Gr. Naz. 1003.446, 1513.99 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \beta \epsilon \iota \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \acute{\epsilon}$ /, after the pattern of [Hes.] F195 ~ Scut. 36 $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \beta \epsilon \nu \delta' \alpha \rho' \epsilon \acute{\epsilon}$ / (cf. [Apolin.] 39.19). Nonnos (Met. 4.157-8, 6.153-4) switches the order of verb and noun, as does [Orph.] L. 333 in the related $\epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \beta \omega \epsilon \iota \nu$ / (cf. ψ 54; but ($\kappa \alpha \iota$) $\epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \epsilon \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \beta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ($\epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \xi \tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \beta \epsilon \nu$) $\epsilon \acute{\epsilon}$ / ix.280, Gr. Naz. 501.41). $\epsilon \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \delta \omega \rho$ itself was very much in vogue among the Christian poets.

55-8

Possibly Q. means us to think that the portents are manifesting themselves in ratification as Calchas speaks; if so, the dry 'because...' sounds faintly ludicrous, lacking the liveliness and spontaneity of the comparable passages in Virg. A. 1.393f., Stat. Theb. 3.536f. ~ Sen. Her. O. 324f. (cf. S. OC 1456, 1462f., 1477f.). It may be however that the portents have already begun and that a report is made on them in the interests of concision. A.R. shows a tendency to draw strictly narrative elements into the mouths of speakers

(a notable example is 3.891f., Medea confronts a 'chorus' of handmaidens, cf. Fränkel 399, and Bühler, Mosch. Eur. pp. 145-6). Maybe Q. would have considered 1236-7 a legitimate precedent.

55

The language is, as often, strongly Aratean in flavour: 411-12 τὰ δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα πιφαύσκει/βήματα. βήματα δ' οὐκ ἀτέλειετ': for the form cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 2.496-/βήματα δ' οὐκ ἀίδηλα (sq. γάρ), for οὐκ ἀτ. Δ168 τὰ μὲν (destruction of Troy) ἐβέετα οὐκ-α/(sim. Or. Sib. 3.699, cf. id. 571); σ 345 ἄρ' οὐκ-α γέγοντο/ν Bion F17.2 καὶ ὠκ-α γέγοντο (conj. -οντο)/. βήματα... ἀναφαίνεται: in a different sense, [Orph.] A. 461 ἀνεφαίνετο βήμα; Nonnos has the active in the same sense, 38.79.

ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα: v. 408, xiv. 522(.. δούρατα ~ Opp. Hal. 4.408-9). The same clausula in Emp. F35.6, Opp. supr., Cyrus AP9.808.10, Anon. APlan. 274.3.

56-7

Ζηνὰς .../βρονταί: υ 121 /Ζηνὰς .. βροντῇ.

56

ἄ del. Bonitz. The author of ἄ links βήματα Ζηνός: then, faced with a stop at Ζηνός, indulges his gross stupidity. μέγα κτυπέουσι: Q. is predictably fond of this unit. It is used by Homer of Zeus' thunder. Cf. infr. 510n., and 198(O 377=Scut. 383), viii. 69-70. δὴ' αἰ' Ἰθρης: i. 692 (Zeus' βτεροπαί and κεραυνοί) θαμέες (ν xii. 199) ποτέοντο δὴ' αἰ' Ἰθρης/. The same clausula in Arch. GPh 3606(-ρας); Lucill. AP11.106.1(ἐποῶτο); Man. 2.131.

57

βρονταὶ ὁμῶς βτεροπῇσι: ii. (348-)349, infr. 198(viii. 381 ὁμῶς βτ.); sim. Hes. Th. 690-1 κεραυνοί/.. ἄμα βροντῇ τε καὶ ἀβτεροπῇ. On Q.'s love of 'x plus(δμῶς)χ' see T. Mommsen, Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen, Berlin 1895, 231-2.

58

δεξιοὶ ὀρνίθες: ctr. ω 311-12 ὀρνίθες ../δεξιοί; N 621a1. δεξιοὶ ὀρνίς/. -αἰβέουσι in the previous line is suggested by A 320a1. ταναῇ ὀπι' is an unparalleled expression, but the pattern already exists in Homer's

ἀλὶ γῆ ὀπί (§ 492) and A.R.'s ἀγανῆς ἀδινῆ, ἀιγυρῆ, μέγλη. Ταναός here = τεταμένος, 'high-pitched' (cf. xi. 110 γεράνοις τανυφθούγοις, 'screeching'); along similar lines i. 681 ταναοῖο .. κέρως ~ E. Or. 322 ταναὸν λιθέρ³ (Benedetto ad loc. aptly compares Hes. Op. 549), cf. Men. Sam. 326 from E.; [Orph.] L. 11. κεκλήγοντες : -ότες H. -ώτες and/or the unmetrical -ότες are attested as variants in Homer (M¹²⁵ etc.) as elsewhere (cf. Scout. 379, 412; Arat. 1004; ix. 307 -ότες vel -ώτες codd.). See Schneider, Call. 1. 150f.; Cauer 74; Erbse on schol. M¹²⁵.

59f.

Calchas harks back to his initial recommendation of 8f.

59

ἀλλ' ἄγε μηκέτι : v 296 (.. λεγόμεθα), u 314. πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον : in this sedes o 494 (= Call. F260.63), xiv. 219; in others: x. 23, xii. 365; Anon. AP 9.574.3. Cf. 14n.

60

Τρωεὶν γὰρ : similarly K⁴²¹ ... / ἐξδουτίν' Τρωεὶν γὰρ ...

60-1

ἐνέπνευσεν ... / θάρσος : cf. ε 381 θάρσος ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα δαίμων /, viii. 327 Τρῶεσσι δ' ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα θάρσος / — but 373 infr. Ἥρη γὰρ ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα κάρτος /. For the interchange of θάρσος and κάρτος (99n.; cf. κάρτιστοι in 62) cf. ii. 275-6 (Nestor to Thrasymedes) ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ πονεώμεθ', ἐπεὶ μέγα κάρτος ἀνδύκη / πολλὰ κὶ μαρναμένοις καὶ οὐτιδανοῖσιν ὀπάζει ~ xiii. 121-2 (they forgot their fear) ἐπεὶ μέγα θάρσος ἀνδύκη / ὤπασεν. ἐνέπνευσεν .. ἀνδύκη finds an echo in xiv. 564. μέγ' .. / θάρσος : cf. iii. 597, x. 99, infr. 254corr.; Bissinger 161. — The form of these lines is mirrored in Odysseus' words at 232-3.

61

ὅ' ... ἐγείρει is no doubt an echo of Hes. Op. 20 ἡ' τε καὶ ἀπάλαμόν περ δμῶς ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει (West, *Philologus* 113, 1969, 5; in his edition he opts for the v.1. ἐγείρεν). Cf. also the formulaic ἐγείρομεν .. Ἄρμα / (Δ 352 al.), καὶ (ὕπνῳ νόντας) ἐγείρει / (Ω 344 al.). καὶ οὐτιδανόν περ : Nic. Ther. 483 (— νοῦ); ctr. vi. 415 οὐτιδανός περ ἔων with ε 515 ἔων ... οὐτιδανός.

62

κάρτιστοι νυ ἄνδρες : [Apolin.] 58.6(Golega 71). For the remainder of the line cf. vii.519 and iv.158. ἐπιμόθ- : see Rzach, SBWW 95, 1879, 719.

62-3

θυμὸν / παρθέμενοι : γ 74al. (cf. SEG 16.497.14, Chios iii-ii), β 237 παρθέμενοι κεφαλᾶς suggest here 'risk'. But at ix.352 παρθ- clearly = ἐνθ-, as at i.(409 ~)413 and ix.(275 ~)279 (rather than 'sans ménager notre vie', Bude; Vian* feels that παρθ- i.q. ἐνθ- would merely repeat 275, whereas on his interpretation it would look forward to τεθναίνην at 283); the sequence of ideas here (θάρος, κάρτιστα) suggests the same interpretation, despite ἄφειδ-ὀλέθρου. At IEG 12.18 ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος Tyrtaeus, a gauche versifier, meant, I think, 'risk' (so B. Snell, Tyrtaios und die Sprache des Epos, Hypomnem. 22, Göttingen 1969, 13-14, with more appreciation of T.'s powers of expression than I can muster); Q. may have understood it differently, as does D.A. Campbell, Greek Lyric Poetry, London 1967, 181, on [his] 9.18.

63

στονόνεντος .. ὀλέθρου : cf. viii.153, x.352, xiii.463. στονόνεις is hard-worked by Q., who occasionally uses Homeric prototypes (xi.436: cf. λ 383 ~ A.R.4.1005; xi.370: cf. Θ 159al. [vi.530, xiii.335 = hHom. 27.6]; x.207: cf. φ 12, 60), but more often different (many of them recurrent) noun-epithet combinations: cf. 18, 204nn. Of these I can parallel only two, σ. πόλεμος (6x, already A.R.1.1052); σ. πόνος infr. 296n. ἄφειδηῶσιν : Kost on Musae. 303.

64

Τρωῖοι νῆες : 45n. ἑταρβέες : 32n.

64-5

ἀμφιμάχονται / ἄβ' τε περί : the same clausula in Π 73 (νῦν ...), Σ 20; cf. -ωνται / Σ 208 ~ x.32, and for ἄβ' τε περί B 801vulg., Π 448, ε 106. Calchas must mean 'are fighting in defence of Troy' and not 'around the walls of Troy': he is expressing himself very obscurely and with scant

regard for Homeric usage (on $\lambda\mu\phi\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ sim. in Homer see J. La Roche, Homerische Studien, Vienna 1861, 109; Bolling, AJPh 81, 1960, 77).

65

$\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\phi\phi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$ = [Apolin.] 47.2. Cf. 440n., and X 173, 230 / $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\Pi\rho\iota\alpha\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$ $\delta\epsilon\phi\iota\epsilon\iota$: the same run in M 416, Opp. Hal. 1.456. $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$... $\eta\tau\omicron\rho$: cf. 532infr., and Θ 413 $\tau\iota'$ $\phi\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\epsilon\nu\iota$ $\phi\rho\epsilon\delta\iota$ $\mu\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\eta\tau\omicron\rho$; /; and for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha$ $\mu\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ (Q. only) ii.234, vii.360, 588, x.69-70; and an attractive conjecture (Koechly) at ix.347, see Keydell, Gnomon 40, 1968, 573.

66-103

Neoptolemos objects to the use of trickery; Philoctetes takes his side. The dispute is resolved by the intervention of Zeus, and the leaders retire to the ships.

Q.'s Neoptolemos is cast in the mould of the Neoptolemos of Sophocles' Philoctetes¹⁶. Just as he there declares that he is ready to take Philoctetes $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\beta\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$... $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\mu\grave{\eta}$ $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ (90-1)—deceit is wholly repugnant to his nature (79f., 88f.)—so here he reacts violently to the suggestion that $\beta\iota\acute{\eta}$ should be sacrificed to $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. Calchas at xii.19f.); violently, but courteously, dealing as he is with a man of god (for N.'s piety cf. esp. vii.704; ctr. Tydeus in A. Th. 382f.). He is a man not of words¹⁷, but of action, and confident of success by prowess (note esp. ix.275f.), who shares with Philoctetes (xi.490f.; similarly Numanus in Virg. A. 9.598f., Caesar in Lucan 2.494f.) the view that the Trojans are cowards to skulk within their ramparts.

For heroic defiance of $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ cf. Idas in A. R. 3.555f. (sanctioned—in a roundabout way—by an omen involving a hawk and a dove); and Sil. 5.77f.: Corvinus addresses the Romans, advises them on the basis of omens not to fight yet, rather bellandum est astu (100); Flaminius objects, refusing to fight within a rampart (121f.), and appealing to virtus (126).

The motif of Neoptolemos' opposition is unexampled in the (woefully paltry) treatments available to us. It may be stated with absolute confidence

that it is not new!¹⁸—

Should Troy be taken by force or by intelligence? A story of a disagreement on this very topic is alluded to by schol. / 347, θ 77¹⁹ — between Achilles and Odysseus; cf. Hor. Carm. 4.6.13f.: Achilles would never have deceived the Trojans by allowing himself to be shut up in a horse, he would have acted palam²⁰. In λ 528f. Odysseus tells the gleeful shade of Achilles that Neoptolemos was the only member of the Horse not to weep and quake with fear; he earnestly implored Odysseus to let him emerge, and thirsted for Trojan blood—which is to say, only Odysseus cannot say it—that he wants action: δόλος is not to his liking. When Seneca takes up the theme the δόλος-motif is made explicit: Ag. 636f. fremuit male subdolo/parens Pyrrhus Ulixi. Philostratus (Her. 4.3) portrays Sthenelus as an exact equivalent of Q.'s Neoptolemos: καὶ τὸν Ἰππὸν δὲ τὸν κοῖλον παρητεῖτο Σθένετος, οὐ τειχομαχίαν [cf. 90n.] τοῦτο φάσκων εἶναι, ἀλλὰ κλοπὴν τῆς μάχης.

The objectors obey καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλοντε (100), and Neoptolemos is certainly not comfortable at λ 528f., Sen. Ag. 636f. Q. settles the question differently. Neoptolemos enters the Horse with good grace (275f.) and we hear no more of him until he embarks upon his trail of carnage (xiii. 213f.).

66

For the general shape cf. γ 189 Ἀχιλλῆος.. φαίδιμος υἱός /; Ε 179a1. (τὸν δ' αὖτε) προσέειπε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός, Λ 605, 837. ὥς φάμενον ... is a heavily repeated sequence in Q. Apart from vi. 429 and xiii. 532 (cf. Nonn. 31.228) always / ὥς —ον (—ην) προσέειπε(ν), with a variety of repetitive patterns:— (i) xii. 66=vii. 219 +3; Ἀχιλλέος ὀβριμὸς υἱός / 3 further times, accus. viii. 195. (ii) 73infr. —ε μένος Λαερτιάδαο /, see n. (iii) 274infr. —ε πᾶσι ξανθοῦ Ἀχιλλῆος / = vii. 667. (iv) v. 165, 427 —εν εὐρυμέλειος Ἀγαμέμνων /: cf. 339n. (v) vi. 84 —ε πύκα φρονέων Μενέλαος / = (φάμεν) xiv. 165: cf. 219n. Sim. v. 559 —ε φίλα φρονέων Ἀγαμέμνων /; φ.φρ. Homeric, and cf. vii. 207, viii. 148. (vi) xiii. 198 —ε κραταῖου Τυδείος υἱός /: cf. 326n. — In addition to the above, Q. has / ὥς φάμεν

1x, -οι 1x; -οιο 3x, -ης 3x. The following tables show the relative frequencies of this unit outside Q. in (a)nomin. and (b)oblique cases. The later popularity of (b) brings to mind popular Roman runs of the type haec fantem..., talia dicentem..., talia dicenti... ait etc., which could conceivably have influenced both Q. and Nonnos.

(a)	/ωτ -ος	-η Dor. -α	-οι -αι
Hom.	E 290	E 835a1, cf. v 429	κ 446
Call.		<u>Lav. Pall.</u> 131	
Theoc.		24.10	
A.R.		2.291	
Mosch.		<u>Eur.</u> 108	
Triph.	152	463, 497	
Gr. Naz.			1372.263
Nonn.	<u>Met.</u> 18.1; <u>D.</u> 7x	<u>D.</u> 39x	
Musae,		194	
Paul. Sil.	<u>Ecphe.</u> <u>Soph.</u> 255	id. 243	

(b)	-ου -οιο; -ης	-οι -ηι	-η
[Pind.]			Cf. I. 6. 49 <u>ταὐτ' ἄρα</u>
Call.		Cf. F260.62 / <u>τῆι</u> ... <u>ως</u> -ηι...	οἱ -η ...]
Dion. Bass.		F19v49 <u>ως</u> <u>φάμεν</u>	
Nonn.	<u>Met.</u> 11.176 -ου; <u>D.</u> :- -ου 37x; -οιο 1x; -ης 10x	<u>D.</u> :- -οι 1x; -ηι 6x	<u>D.</u> : 2x

67-8

A similarly expressed sentiment in Rhesus 510f.

67f.

Κάλλαν: so A 86; Κάλλα reportedly Zen. (cf. Chantraine 1.208): ctr. 275n.

σηΐοι ... μαρνανται: but A 190, 205 / μαρνανται σηΐοι . καταντίον:

first in S. Ant. 512. Common in Q., it is well established in later verse:

Damag. HE 1433, then Or. Sib. 1.234, Man. 5.230, Gr. Naz. 596.236, 1473.303, Claud.

Gig. (2) 20 [cf. 166n.], [Orph.] A. 1214, Nonn. 2.385, Jo. Gaz. 1.207. ἄλκιμοι

ἄνδρες = AP 3.16.3; cf. Φ 586 ἄλκιμοι ἄνδρες -x (v.l. ant. ἄνδρες); Π 689

= P 177 -οι ἄνδρες (2 ...) ~ iv.258 (4 ...; cf. iv.482); ix.224 -ος ἄνδρ /

= [Opp.] Cyn. 2.475, Or. Sib. 11.145, orac. in Inscr. Magn. 17.36 (Parke-Wormell 381).

The reverse order is much less frequent: Pi. N. 5.15, S. Ph. 326, Damag. HE 1397-8

(= GVI 1464).

68-9

Neoptolemos in stilted language counters Calchas' observations on ὀτιδανῶν at 61: they may be desperate enough to offer resistance, but cooped up as they are inside the city they are still by definition ὀτιδανῶν and will fight according to type, i.e. they will ultimately succumb. Odysseus in turn counters N.'s ἀλκιμα ἄνδρες with ... ἀλκή (77) and his πόνος with ... πονεῦμενοι (79), and later, with considerable irony, presses home his contention that the end justifies the means (225f., see Vian there).

68

ἀλευόμενοι : -όμενοι Pauw, 'in an effort to avoid <direct confrontation>'. It is true that codd. are not always reliable (cf. i. 21, x. 212; variants at iii. 361, xi. 317), and that vii. 517 has a present (μάρνεσθ' ἐνδον ἑόντες ἀλευόμενοι ...). But Neoptolemos' point is that the Trojans have disappeared behind their ramparts and are going to conduct operations within them: cf. infr. 159; Vian, Rech. 161, where examples of pres. and aor. partic. are classified and discussed. (But -όμενος must not be viewed solely against the background of variae lectiones in Hom. Examples in post-Alexandrine verse: Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 77, Kost on Musae. 36: add orac. in AppAnth. 255.1; the Oppians, see James s.v. ἀλέονται; Gr. Naz. 978.115 (v.l. aor.); Paul. Sil. AP 9.764.4 [Viansino 12]). ἀπὸ πύργων: M₁₅₄ /σ' δ' ... ἀπὸ πύργων/ ~ xi. 336-7 σ' δ' ἀπὸ πύργων/μάρναντ'; cf. also Triph. 338, 644, Nonn. 35.266.

69

δέμα : common in Q., normally = δέος. Once only in Homer, but widespread in later epic. A.R. in particular is fond of it.

70

In spite of N₂₃₀ (/τῷ ὤν μῆτις) and K₂₄₉ Φ₂₈₈ (μῆτις... μῆτε τι [... γάρ]) I believe that Koechly's μῆτε δόλον should be abandoned in favour of the transmitted μῆτι, which is more vigorous ('let us not under any circumstances') and finds a parallel at i. 472-3 οὔτι.... οὔτ'. Cf. 19 above, τῷ ὤν μῆτι, which Neoptolemos is evidently recalling here. —

Vian* concurs. δοῖον φρασώμεθα: an uncommon expression: cf. Gr. Naz. 1320.

180, 1504.331, and earlier (in reverse order) A.R. 3.20. τι μήχους: x.11; iv.68
 ὡς ἐ' τι μήχους / = B 342a1., A.R. 2.444.

71

ῥιπτεῖς: short-stem forms of substantives in -εύς are used in archaic epic mainly, though not by any means exclusively, for proper names: see the useful survey in G.P. Shipp, Studies in the Language of Homer², Cambridge 1972, 65f. Later poets are in general much stricter (e.g. Triph.: Ὀδυσσεύς 475 cf. Weinberger WS 18, 1896, 127f.; [Orph.] A.: Πηλεΐς 130, cf. Dottin's edition, p. cvii; there is a rich collection of examples in K. Lehrs, Kleine Schriften, Königsberg 1902, 121), but Q. admits τοκέες (2) -έων (4) -έεσσι (2); and ῥιπτεῖς (1) -έας (3). This last is the reading of Ar. at 189 (: ῥοττεῖας), cf. Ludwig 1.300, who notes: 'de Aristarchea lectione sane ex Quinto nihil omnino sequitur'. Examples of this form in earlier verse: Pi. I. 8.55; Soph., Eur. ~ Call. Iamb. F194.51, Lyc. 298; Theoc. 18.17; Mnaseal. HE 2625; epic. (?) adesp. CA 9.6.12. ῥιπτεῖς .. ῥίνδρας: cf. 28n., and σ 261 μάχη τὰς ἐμμεναι ῥίνδρας /. The text, much vexed by older scholars (e.g. ῥειρεῖας for ῥιπτεῖας Hermann; lacuna after ῥρ. Koechly) is sound: ῥρ. ῥίνδρας must be taken together, so we have to supply ἡμεῖς (Vian): cf. Γ 44 (Leaf ad loc.) / πάντες ῥιπτεῖα πρόμον ἐμμεναι sc. 6ε.

72

δορί: this dative (not in early epic) again in viii.366, xi.80 (and C.L. Struve's δορί is tempting at i.256, cf. West 258), occurs also in Colluth. 177, where Livrea seems to me to quote the wrong parallels. It is widespread in the epigram from the Alexandrine era on (e.g. Leon. HE 2031; GPh 594 [Antip. Thess.], 2105 [Diod.], 3530 [Alph.]; GVI passim) and had no doubt made inroads into straight hexameters well before Q.'s day. I doubt whether the notion 'unhomerical' would have entered his head (or, for that matter, the heads of the audience listening to E. Andr. 105). θαλασσίεοι ... φῶτες: cf. iv. 323, 434-5, and for the sentiment η 50-1 (Athene to Odysseus as he enters Scheria): 'do not be afraid, θαλασσίεος γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμείνων / ἐργασίῳ

τελέθει [ν iv.435]'. ἐν δαὶ φῶται :vii.554corr. ἐν δαὶ φῶται ν

'Simon.' EpGr.153Page φωτῶν/. Q. is partial to ἐν δαί"; cf. N286al.;

Hes.Th.650,674;Theoc.22.79;Antip.Sid.HE 178. Nowhere else in post-Alexandrine verse.

73

See on 66. μῆνος Λαερτιάδω :sim.v.363 μ. Τελαμωνιάδω/. Homer has μ. Ἀκταρίδω/(Π189), Ἀτρεΐδω/(Λ268,272). For this kind of periphrasis in a speech introduction cf. η 178, al.

74

ὦ τέκος ὀβριμόθυμον =vii.294,xiii.226(ἐυπτολέμον Ἀχιλλῆος/), cf.vii.642.

For the incipit ὦ τέκος(Q. 4x)cf. Λ425 η 22; [Hes.] F248.1;A.R.2.420;

Gr.Naz.548.349,1542.282;Nonn.D.18.316 +4. For ὀβριμόθυμον,220n.

ἄταρβρος Αἰακίδω :again iii.522 +3. Q. uses the Homeric hapax ἄταρβρής (32n.)in noun-epithet combinations of Achilles(cf.ix.46;i.101,iii.513), Eurypylus(vii.622),Heracles(vi.137). Of Homer's formulaic ποδωκέος Αἰακίδω/(often), ἄμύμονος (2), Α. δαΐφρονος (Κ402 Ρ76)he has only the last (iii.16 +4),but uses this model to indulge his craving for -φρων compounds: θραύφρονος Α./ i.4 +3(reversed at i.766,vii.708), κρατερόφρονος Α./ iii.212,ix.236(=anon.ep.PSI 722.2,pap.iiip.).

75-6

ταῦτα ... μᾶλα πάντα διίκεο :a combination of β306 /ταῦτα ... μᾶλα πάντα and T186 πάντα διίκεο, cf.also πάντα διίξομαι 161,hDem.416 =

D.P.650,Nonn.48.422;and A.R.2.411 /ὦ γέρον... διίκεο. μᾶλα πολλὰ (codd.)is from 79 below. For the lacuna in H see Vian,Histoire de la tradition manuscrite de Ψ.S.,Paris 1959,104.

75

ταῦτα ... ἐπέδικεν :/ταῦτ]α μὲν ὥς ἐπέδικε is the obvious supplement in Rhian.(?)POxy.2883.i.8(Luppe,Gnomon 46,1974,647). For ὥς ἐπ. cf.Gr.Naz. 996.348 and (-ε)A.R.3.991,Dion.Bass.F19v50;more commonly at the close of the verse(ii.135): υ 293 ω 481, and v.1.(pap.)Λ595;Cleanth.CA 1.37;Damag. HE 1429;Gr.Naz.581.31,1524.35. ἄμύμονι ... ἐβόλω :cf.x.119 ἄμύμονε

φῶτε ; Pi. I. 8.60 ἐβλόν.. φῶτα. ἀνύμων is generally used by Q. of 'heroic' individuals whose attributes no one could or would fault — a complex of attributes (cf. iii. 423f.) or more often supreme courage and/or strength. For a discussion of the term see A.A. Parry, Blameless Aegisthus, Mnem. Suppl. 26, 1973 (with some examples from Q., 272f., but the notion of 'physical flawlessness' is given undue emphasis).

76

Cf. [Apolin.] 135.23 (Golega 73). Θαράλειος in Homer is linked only with ἀγορεύειν; none of the numerous instances in Q. furnishes a parallel.

χερδὶ πεποιθώς : Π 624.

77-8

ὄτ' ... ἀλκή/έβθενεν...: so vii. 590-1 οὐδέ σ' ἀλκή/... βθένει ; x. 355-6 / οὐδέ γὰρ οὐδέ θεῶν τις ... / έβθενεν δ' ἄλβιον ἄβτω διαπραθέεν Πριάμοιο, suggested no doubt by A.R. 2. 1052-3 / οὐδέ γὰρ Ἡρακλῆς.... έβθενε. These lines have the slick ring of a topos: cf. Virg. A. 2. 196f. ~ Sen. Ag. 614f.; Diosc. AP 5. 138; Agath. id. 9. 152 [Viansino 29]. Seneca's Neoptolemos is made to insist that Achilles did capture Troy (Tro. 204f.).

77

ἄκαμάτοιο: an epithet that is given no rest in this poem. In Homer applied only to πῦρ, rarely so in Q. (v. 387, xi. 94, xiv. 455). Cf. here iii. 130 εὖ πατρός ἄκαμάτοιο, and below on 152, 195. Achilles is impiger in Hor. Ars 120-1; Aetna 592-3. τεῶν πατρῶν: vii. 194, = Achilles; Homer πατὴρ τεός (J 739al., often later). Cf. xiii. 219 (Neopt.) πατρός εὖ κατακείμενος ἀλκήν/. ἄτρομος: 465n.

78

δ' ἄλβιον ἄβτω διαπραθέεν: cf. x. 356 (cited on 77-8), iii. 29 διέπραθε δ' ἄλβιον ἄβτω/, sim. iv. 478. δ' ἄλβιον ἄβτω is rare outside Q., but it could have been in current use in his day: cf. Ibyc. SLG 151. 1-2 Πριάμοιο μέ—/ γ' ἄβτω] τυ .. δ' ἄλβιον ἠνάρσον (the first example, if the piece really is by Ibycus, of δ' ἄλβιος used in this way: C. De Heer, ΜΑΚΑΡ-ΕΥΑΛΙΜΩΝ-ΟΛΒΙΟΣ-ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ, Amsterdam 1969, 37), Anon. ap. St. Byz. s. Ταρτηβέος (=Schneider,

Call.fr.anon.316), and two verse inscriptions of the late empire: IME 140.3, 145.3. ῥέτυ διαπραθεῖν υυ-χ : v.l.(vulg.) Λ 733. ῥέτυ .. Πριδμοιο : a common unit in Homer, but never in this sedes.

79

μάλα πολλὰ πονεύμενοι : | 348(πονήβατο). ῥῥῥ' ῥέγε θῥεσον : T 68 Υ 257; at vii.423 and(θ. ἐλς ἐπὶ νῆας ῥόντες/παινώμεσθα)viii.455 ε υυ ῥῥῥ ..., cf. K 44; Batr. 23.

80

δοῦς : this indispensable Homeric tag is common in Q. Cf. here e.g. x.349; A 12, τ 238.

81-3

This whole sequence is inspired by O 411-12 / τέκτονος ἐν παλάμῃ δαήμονος, ὅς ῥα' τε Ἀθήνης/.

81

ῥῥῥον τεκταίνωμεν : 28n. ῥπαὶ παλάμῃν ῥεπειού : the same pattern in [Orph.] L.646 ῥπαὶ-ῥεῖ Κρόντο ; cf. earlier Hes. Th. 866 ῥφ' ῥεφάϊτος -ῥεῖν /.

81-2

ῥεπειού /... τέτυκται : cf. A 90-1 Ἀγαμέμνονα.. / ὅς νῦν πολλὸν ῥρίβτος Ἀχαιῶν εὐχεται εἶναι, Z 7 / ἄνδρα .. ὅς ῥρίβτος ἐνὶ Θρήκεσσι τέτυκτο/, B 274 (cf. anon. ep. GDK 18r4) ῥρίβτον ἐν Ἀργείοσιν.

82

ὅς ῥα' τε : for this and ~~ε~~ related units see Ruijgh, TE 439f. This incipit also X 23, χ 403; Arat. 226; Euph. CA F64; D.P. 25, 230, 800; Man. 3.413.

83

εἴνεκα τεκτοσύνης : cf. vii.651 / εἴνεχ' ὁμοφροσύνης (which closes a pentam. in EGr. 555.2 Kaibel). This formation appears from time to time in the hexameter: [Hes.] F 132 / εἴνεκα μαχλοσύνης; A.R. 2.180 μαντοσύνης; Man. 6.207 κλεπτοσύνης; it opens a pentam. in GVI 662.2 (Rome, i-ii), 2055.2 (Athens, ii-iii). — εἴνεκα may mean just 'in the sphere of', 'in'; but it is tempting to think that Odysseus (never one to boast about other people's

merits: note that it is not he who reacts to Sinon's show of gallantry, infr.254f.) is thinking of Epeius' deficiencies in other areas (108n.):

'ἄριστος as far as ... goes'. τεκτοσύνης: Homeric hapax, ε 250 εὐ εἰδώς τεκτοσύνων / ν viii.296 δαήμονι τ. / (after π 253). Otherwise only in sing., E. Andr. 1015; Nicharch. HE 2749 (= GVI 1727); Man. 4.323a1.; GVI 2052.2 (Rome, ii-iii); epigr. ap. Robert Hellen. 4, p. 73.6 (Ephesus, iii p.). δέδαιεν ... Ἀθήνη: δέδαιεν is regularly used of divine instruction, see Pfeiffer on Call. F701. For the language here cf. υ 72 ἐργα δ' Ἀθηναίη δέδαιε ; Σ 233f. = ψ 160f. ἐν Ἡφαιετος δέδαιεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / τέχνην (ἐργα 234/161); θ 448 μιν δέδαιε. The same verb is employed with reference to Epeius in Stesich. SLG 89.7-8 θῆρας ἰ[ό]τατι δαῖς γεν[ε]ας Ἀθάνης / μετ[ρα] τε καὶ βοφίαν ...

84

ὥς ... ἄρα: often in Homer, e.g. Δ 208. For the remainder of the line cf. i.163-4 τοὶ δ' ... πεπιδόντο / ἄνδρες ἄριστῆες ; Theoc. 22.99 σὺ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἄριστῆες κελύδεσσαν / ; K 117 πάντας ἄριστῆας (same sedes).

84-5

πάντες ... / νόεφί: similarly vii.432-3 πάντας ... / νόεφί Νεοπτολέμοιο θρασύφρονος, cf. iv.274-6; α 19-20; hAp. 92-5.

85

Νεοπτολέμοιο δαίφρονος: elsewhere N. θρασύφρονος, vii.433 (above), 524, 615. Q. may have had in mind δ 687 Τηλεμάχιο δαίφρονος, σὺ δέ ..., and cf. Z 161-2 cited on 85-6 below. σὺ δὲ μὲν ἐβόλον: viii.356 (—ή), ix.205 (—οῖς), cf. ii.297 σὺ τε μὲν —οῖ / ; so Hes. Op. 214 (—ός). At the source stands the Homeric formula / σὺ κακὸν σὺ δὲ μὲν ἐβόλον (= Gr. Naz. 1005.473; varied by id. 558.484 = Antioch. Astr. 1.109.21; Ps. Phoc. 2.5).

85-6

σὺ δὲ ... / πεῖθε .. νόον .. φρονέοντος: Q. borrows key words from Z 161-2 ἄλλὰ τὸν σὺ τι / πεῖθ' ἄγαθὰ φρονέοντα, δαίφρονα Βελλεροφόντην, α 42-3 / ὥς ἐφάθ' .. ἄλλ' σὺ φρένας Αἰγυίοιο / πεῖθ' ἄγαθὰ φρονέων. Cf. also Scut. 450, [Orph.] A. 293-6, and for σὺ δὲ ... M 173. ἐβόλον / ...

νόον : with the exception of this and Thgn. IEG 792 the substantive comes first: [Orph.] H. 86.7; η 73, Thgn. IEG 223, Anon. ap. Phil. Incorr. Mund. 500; [Apolin.] 106, 45; N 732-3, Thgn. IEG 1054, 1271, Trag. Adesp. 296.3 Nauck, Or. Sib. 1.304, EpGr. 874.3 Kaibel (Sparta, ii-iii).

86

κρατερὰ φρονέοντος : vi. 216 Kr. -οντε /; only in Q. For νόον ... cf. / 554 νόον (πύκα περ) φρονέοντων /, v. 1. -οντος.

87

Neoptolemos thirsts for war on his departure for Troy (vii. 356f.). We may well believe that he is 'still unglutted' here, but the same notion savours of the ridiculous in vii. 602f., his first entry into combat. ἑμίης

... ἄκόρητοι : the four allied Homeric units are these: (i) N 621 δειῆς ἄκόρητος ἄντης / (ii) N 639, γ 2 μάχης ἄκόρητοι (-ον) υ-χ (iii) H 117 μόθου .. ἄκόρητος / (iv) M 335 ποθέμενον ἄκορητῶν. All found imitators: (i) Scut. 459 δειῆς -ος ἄντης / and, without δειῆς, 346, 433 (cf. G. P. Edwards, The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context, Oxford 1971, 63), Anon. ep. ap. schol. Pi. N. 3. 64, Anon. hex. (imperial) POxy. 2524 F8. 4; so probably Tyrt. IEG 19. 4. (ii) vii. 664; EpGr. 993. 5 Kaibel (Thebes, imperial). (iii) Nonn. 13. 171, 21. 262, 30. 297. (iv) Or. Sib. 13. 15, 92. Variations are found in tragedy (cf. A. Pers. 999 ἀρχμᾶς ἄκορετον and A. Sideras, Aeschylus Homericus, Hypomnem. 31, Göttingen 1971, 191), and in Q. (δμοκλήης 1. 561, vii. 602-3; δμίης here and infr. 279, cf. Nonn. 32. 166). ὑψυρήης : 22n. ἄκορητοι : put a comma, not a stop, after this word.

88

ῥομαίνον .. μάχεσθαι : this verb rarely takes the infin. (LSJ s. v. I4; add Bacch. F20(B)3); cf. Φ 572 ῥομαῖο ... μάχεσθαι. μάχεσθαι ἀνὰ κλόνον = xi. 140; Ψ 713 μάχοιτο κατὰ κλόνον. ὑπὲρ δὲ λαούς : similar clause-ae: (i) λαοὶ Q. 7x: X 408; Γ 136 = ψ 283; A. R. 3. 885; Nonn. 37. 583. (ii) λαῶν iii. 603 = A. R. 1. 238.

88-9

λαούς / ἐφωιτέρον : A. R. 4. 273-4 λαῶν / ἐφωιτέρων. This is an assembly

of chieftains: whence this duo's 'troops' appear, we are not told: ἀμφί presumably means that they are thronging round about, not too far away to be called up should the need arise.

89

ἀπειρέσιον .. τεῖχος: cf. xiv. 651, and 212n. περὶ τεῖχος: clausul. in X 168 (cf. κ 3), [Hes.] F33(a) 20, i. 801. Cf. further vii. 415 (~ Z 327-8), 454 (cf. M 177), 577 (~ Dem. Bith. CA 4.3, cf. M 178), 605.

90

Q. (cf. τειχομαχία in Sthenelus' complaint, 66-103n.) is hinting at siege-engines [how did he interpret / 573f., M 36f.?], an anachronism in which the Roman poets were happy to indulge: Ovid introduces a Ballista-simile into his story of the Calydonian boar-hunt (Met. 8.357f.); Seneca includes in Hippolytus' tirade against modern life a criticism of war-engines (Phaed. 534f.); Statius goes so far as to make Pylos and Messene contribute murorum tormenta to the Greek war-effort (Ach. 1.422). πάντα φέρειν ἔλα: cf. vii. 55. δῆριν ... ὀφέλλει: a Hesiodic expression, Op. 14 (ἔρις) πρόλεμον ... καὶ δῆριν ὀφέλλει /, id. 33; varied in v. 575, vii. 168. Q. uses a number of repetitive patterns involving δῆρις, a δὲ λέγ. in Homer, P 158, ω 515, the former copied in iv. 271, adapted in v. 419; cf. below, 92, 230 (nn.). ὀφέλλει here = 'advances'; Vian sees the verb as a direct synonym of ὠφελεῖν, and some of the examples adduced by LSJ s.v. ὀφέλλω certainly come very close to such a sense. ἐνὶ πολλέμοισιν: GVI 1149.3 (= IME 4, ii a.), i. 567, 711 (δάμνηαν /) ~ Or. Sib. 14.114 (δαμέντες /). Equally often ἐνὶ ...: A.R. 1.467; GVI 944.1 (= IME 66, ii-i); iii. 254, 384; Nonn. 20.219 (but ἐνὶ πλεόνεσσι acutely West, CQ n.s. 12, 1962, 225).

91

ἐλπομένη ... ἐξαλαπάξει: N 813 ἐέλπεται ἐξαλαπάξεν /, v. 1. ἀξαι. πολλέθρον εὐκτεπον ἐξαλαπάξει: this and xiii. 352-3 are variations on Δ 33 = Θ 288; Φ 433 [cf. Bacch. 11.120f.]. Any or all of these passages may have given birth to Ω's εὐκτίμενον here. (The shorter form has remained intact at xiii. 59 τρώων πολλέθρον εὐκτεπον). This unctura is peculiar

to Q., but cf. [Hes.] F211.5 πό' λιν [λ'] λ' πα[ρ]εν εὐκτιπ[ο]ν (Vian, REG 74, 1961, 271).

92

Cf. vii.190, 220; ix.325f. ~ Pi. P. 1.55; S. Ph. 841, 990. Βουλήδαι θεῶν : Hes. Th. 993; ii.567. ἐς δῆριν ἴκοντο : cf. Nonn. 45.92 ἐς .. δῆριν ἴκλνει /, [Orph.] L. 579 ἐς δῆριν ἰόντα /. It comes as no surprise to see δῆριν here hard on the heels of δῆριν two lines above.

93-100

The thunder sequence here and at infr. 196-201 follows thoroughly traditional lines: e.g. Θ 75-7 (μεγαλ' ἐκτυπε; πάντας... δέος ἐξέλεν /); Θ 131 (/καί νύ κε ...) -8; E. Ph. 1181-2 (ὥς τε δεῖναι πάντας); Batr. 285-9 (βαλὼν .. κεραυνόν /; ἐλέλιξεν /; / πάντας .. ἐφοβήσε); V. Fl. 3.249f.; Claud. Rapt. 2.228f. ~ 232f. invitae cessere...

93-4

καί νύ κε ... / εἴ μὴ ... : the function of this sequence is well described by Ruijgh, 59: 'indique le moment où l'intervention d'un dieu ou un événement a détourné le cours naturel des choses' (cf. id., TE 186, 436). Il. and Od. yield 25 examples [wrong figures in West on Hes. Th. 836, taken over by Richardson on hDem. 310-3]; q.'s shorter poem as many as 24, and Nonnos too overworks the routine, cf. Peek s.v. νύ. The present lines are full of self-repetition: cf. on the one hand iii.752-3, ix.403-4 (also ix. 24 αἰψ' ἐτέλλεσσεν; viii.400 ἡθέλε θυμός /, Homeric clausula) with λ 317 /καί νύ κε ἐξέτελλεσσεν (sim. Batr. 268); and on the other i.689-70, xiv. 419-21 with hDem. 310, 313 /καί νύ κε / εἴ μὴ Ζεὺς ἐνόησεν ...

93

[Theoc.] 25.53 πᾶν δ' θέλεις αἰψα χρέος ἐκτετέλλεται /; v 40 τετέλλεται εἴ μοι φίλος ἡθέλε θυμός /.

94

ἀπ' αἰθέρος : = 258 etc., and often later; cf. here v. 207; viii.351-2; xiii.559. ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖαν = epigr. ap. Merkelbach, ZPE 20, 1976, 82.3. Hesiod has the clausula ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα / with reference to Zeus' thunder (Th. 839 ~ ii.640,

cf. [Hes.] F54(a)4,7-9 with West's ingenious supplements). ... ^{γαῖα} also
hHom. 28.10, ii.200 (corr.); incipit: v.486; internally: Hes. Th. 693 (thunder);
 xi.127, 160. ... γαίη /: Hes. Th. 176; Nonn. D. 18.130 +8.

95

ἐλ' ἐλίζεν ὑπαὶ ποδὶ: cf. 398 *infr.*, and ὑπαὶ ποδὶ in ii.225. εὖν δ'
ἐτίναξεν: xiv.570; cf. P 595 τὴν δ' ἐτίναξεν/.

95-6

εὖν ὑπερθε = 196-7 (corr.), where see note. Similar sequences in
 xi.418f., xiv.570f., for which cf. V 57f., [Hes.] F30.14f.

96

ἡ' ἔρα παῶν ὑπερθε = 197 corr., claus. xiv.461 (splendidly emended by Rhodo-
 mann and Koechly), cf. xi.248-9 παῶν ὑπερθεν/ἡ' ἔρα . παῶν/ἡ' ἔρα , 'the
 whole atmosphere', is found in A.R.4.1666-7, =suppl. in Anon. encom. GDK 35.6-7.
ἑκλόμεντα κεραυνόν: here only.

97

ὑπερμαράχησε: 176n.

97-8

παῖα / Δαρδανίη: xiv.406-7, where, as here, the Troad is meant: Vian, Rech. 122.

98

αἰψα: γ 147... τ' αἰψα θεῶν τρέπεται νόος. μετετρέπεται?.. νόημα:
 cf. xi.274-5; Parmen. GPh 2602 μετέτρεψε νόημα/ ('turned in another direct-
 ion', 'diverted'). ἡὺ νόημα: the same expression in 190 *infr.*, and viii.
 351 (αἰπύ Lloyd-Jones, 274); similarly xiv.227 νόος ... ἡὺς, vii.262,
 xiii.561 εὖς νόος. Suggested perhaps by Homer's νοήματος... ἐβόλῳ /
 (η 292) and νόον ἐβόλῳ (85-6n.), though Q. probably needed no excuse for
 employing ἡὺς εὖς, which for him evidently reeked of archaism.

99

ἐς φόβον: cf. O 310 ἐς φόβον-κ, O 666 τρωπᾶσθε φόβονδε/. The same
incipit in Opp. Hal. 2.264; Nonn. D. 2.711 +13. ἐκ δ' ἐλάθοντο = Opp. Hal.
 4.139, cf. Π 601-2 οὐδ' ... / ἄλκῃς ἐξελάθοντο (~ [Apolin.] 105.43);
 [Apolin.] 77.137 / ἐκ δὲ βίης ἐλάθοντο; xiii.119-20. βίης καὶ κάρτεος:
 θάρτεος Lehrs, comparing 261 *infr.* and ix.228-9; perhaps rightly, but θάρτεος

and $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$, though combined in vii.565, are often used as alternatives in repetitive expressions (cf. 60-1n.), and $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta + \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ here seem apt with reference to the 'strong-arm' tactics of Neoptolemos and Philoctetes. For the expression cf. iii.314 $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta \tau\epsilon \beta\acute{\iota}\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\epsilon\iota$ — x ~ [Apolin.] 58.23 $\pm \upsilon \beta\acute{\iota}\eta \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\epsilon\iota$; A.R.4.273, Opp. Hal. 3.281 $\tau\epsilon \beta\acute{\iota}\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\epsilon\iota$ — x; v.143 = 6.139 $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\epsilon\iota$ — x; iv.317 $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma \upsilon$ — x = Theoc.4.8.

100

$\kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\kappa \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$: cf. 385(n.), and $\gamma_{87} \kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\kappa \epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha \kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\Phi_{48} \kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\kappa - \omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha \nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota / \nu_{v.340} \kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\kappa - \omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$.

101

For a return to the ships after an assembly cf. vi.94 ~ $A_{305f.}, T_{276f.}, \beta_{257f.}$ $\epsilon\varsigma \dots \iota\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ = vii.96; cf. $T_3; \delta_{255}$. In early epic $\epsilon\varsigma$ is rarely kept far away from its accusative: one may compare here hDem.450 $/\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta'\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha \rho\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\nu \iota\varsigma\epsilon$. $\kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$: a clausula at π_{264} etc., but here the equivalent of $\kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma \text{ } \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$, as i.808 ~ iii.727 (cf. xiii.95); x.22; x.383.

102

$\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\nu \lambda\gamma\alpha\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$: for the form cf. 1431, 694 $/\mu\omicron\theta\omicron\nu \lambda\gamma\alpha\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$; $\psi_{64} / \upsilon\beta\omicron\rho\iota\nu \lambda\gamma\alpha\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$. — $\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$ Vian(*), supported by Follet 178; but there seems no good reason why Neoptolemos and Philoctetes could not be said to 'marvel at' the seer whose stratagem had been ratified by a frightening omen; particularly as $\lambda\gamma\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ is often used of grudging admiration. They obeyed Calchas 'unwillingly' (100), but, from this point on, without opposition (103 $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron \dots \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$). $\lambda\acute{\rho}'\epsilon\kappa \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is lifted from Θ_{251} ; no need for Zimmermann's ρ° . $\epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\nu \epsilon\acute{\phi}\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$: cf. ix.415, xiii.502.

103

$\lambda' \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$: $\epsilon\kappa \Delta$. Pauw, more elegantly than ω . — a rare event. $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron \dots$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$: a very common construction, e.g. $\rho_{21} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \pi\acute{\iota}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$, Maced. Thess. AP 5.243.3 $/\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron' \mu\omicron\iota \zeta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha$.

Athene appears to Epeius in a dream with instructions to build the Horse.

In the morning he informs a delighted audience.

Odysseus has already intimated that Epeius will be the one to build the Horse(81f.). Athene, the mentor(83), now confirms the choice. A dream-visitation is an obvious and easy method of direct contact and is probably not new: Athene is said to appear to him in a dream at a later stage in his career with instructions to dedicate his tools²¹. Triph., who makes Odysseus declare that the Horse was built 'by human hands, ἀτὰρ βουλήδιν Ἀθηνῆν' (121, cf. 57), is, as one would expect from ~~the~~ a writer of a scrappy epyllion, short on details: this does not mean that further details were lacking, any more than the fact that the dream-sequence in Q. leans heavily on Homeric prototypes indicates that Q. is responsible for its presence in the story²². Other versions mention Athene; all are hurried or imprecise: θ 493(≈ Polyæn. Strat. 1, proem. 9; Philostr. Her. 11.4-5) τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποτήκεν βὺν Ἀθηνῆν /; Il. Parv. 222f.; E. Tr. 10 μηχανάδι Παλλὰδος, sim. Virg. A. 2.15 ≈ Prop. 3.9.42, Hyg. 108; Ov. Fast. 3.825f.; the Horse is the 'work' of Athene in E. Tr. 561, Triph. ~~the~~ 2, cf. id. 137; 388 (figurative).

The account of the dream incorporates (as do those of i. 124f., xiv. 180f.) many of the features of set routines in Homer²³, notably:-
 (i) B 6f. (time-reference A 605f.): the θεῖος ὄνειρος (56) goes θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας (17), ὅτῃ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ... εἰκώς (20); the dreamer rises from his sleep(41), day dawns(48f.), and the dream is reported to the chieftains, who take immediate action. (ii) δ 795f. (εἰς ὦλον sent by Athene): cf. the rising from sleep and the dreamer's reaction: φίλον δέ σ' ἦτορ ἰάνθη (839-40). (iii) J 15f. Athene visits Nausicaa: 21-2 ὅτῃ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν, / εἰδομένη κόρυνη ; 32: she promises to help the girl; 48f.: dawn arrives, and the dream is reported; see also on 107f. — Homeric treatments of dreams and visions of course attracted a host of imitations, both Greek and Roman, not only in structural terms but also in individual details, as Virg. A. 4.558 omnia Mercurio similis; 'standing above the head': e.g. V. Fl. 4.24, Claud. Gild. 1.329,

Nonn.20.42; the dreamer's joyful reaction: Pi. Q. 13.74, Virg. A. 3. [169f. ~] 178f. — The chief subsequent elaboration (at least in the 'epic' dream/vision) naturally lay in the prefatory Zeitangaben²⁴. Q. mentions stars, and the forgetting of all the hard work of the daytime. The former figure in [Orph.] A. 536f. (cf. also Nonn. 20.23f.). Colluthus 316 (transposed, reading $\nu\upsilon\zeta$ ²⁵) introduces a dream with $\nu\upsilon\zeta \dots \pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\lambda\upsilon\mu\alpha$ (though his point appears to be a different one); but the notion of 'forgetfulness of toil'²⁶ seems to occur in formal Zeitangaben elsewhere only in Roman verse: — dream: Sil. 4.727f. dabant oblivia curis (cf. quies in Virg. A. 2.268; requies curarum Ov. Pont. 3.3.7; night cooperat humanos... sopire labores Claud. Ruf. 2.324); in other connexions: Virg. A. [4.528? stars 524] 9.225; Stat. Theb. 1.341. Fortuitous, maybe: cf. the highly stylised sequences in A. R. 4.1058f., 1629f. Other passages in Q. in similar vein²⁷: — iv.64, night gives men a short respite from toil (cf. Lucan 5.505?); vi.72 ~ x.437, brings to men $\lambda\upsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$ (cf. solverat in Ov. Met. 10.368, Lucan 5.504?); viii.490 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon \dots \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega\nu$ cf. A. R. 4.1058-9 and earlier E. Or. 175.

109-116: it looks from 111a as if Athene herself will be present axe in hand (as she was at the building of Argo, cf. her partnership with Argos in A. R. 2.1187f.) or at least be directing operations (cf. 112, and perhaps Antiph. GPh 999-1000²⁸). 111b is puzzling: one would expect it to mean 'she personally, she said, would go right ($\acute{\alpha}\phi\alpha\rho$) inside <it, the Horse>, so urging <him/them> on to work'. But, the oddity of this apart²⁹, Athene is in fact nowhere in sight during the building-operations, she is elsewhere, and Epeius has to deliver a prayer to her (151f.). What Q. must mean, I think, is that she will (a) work with him by (b) getting right inside <him>, thus spurring him on to get the job done³⁰. The goddess is not said to leave. That is because she is inside Epeius in the form of $\tau\epsilon\chi\eta\eta$ which pervades his soul (116): he 'recognises' the goddess not by any visible token (cf. schol. B 791) but by the infusion of her $\tau\epsilon\chi\eta\eta$ within him. This is the only feasible interpretation of a text that has proved notoriously

inhospitable to emendation; it is disturbing, but not necessarily damaging, that Q. cuts back on this idea somewhat at 146f.: Athene gave him $\tau\epsilon\chi\eta\eta$; and from that she slides back into the anthropomorphic pose adopted at the dream's inception.

All this looks suspiciously like a motif familiar enough in Roman³¹, but not to my knowledge attested in Greek poetry, though given the fact that the notion that a god (or the faculty or gift with which he is associated) may be inside you is common enough in Greek it would be rash to assert that the passage must necessarily be viewed against a Roman background. (i) Ov. Met. 8.819f. The goddess Fames visits Erysichthon in a dream, seque viro inspirat etc. (ii) Sil. 2.515f. The goddess Fides instils herself into the hearts of men, thus filling them with the quality she represents. (iii) Stat. Theb. 10.632f. The goddess Virtus can penetrate men (635) and does so by descending from heaven in human disguise; approaching Menoeceus sese..in corde reliquit (673). (iv) Stat. Silv. 3.1.89f. This passage differs from the above in two respects: it is concerned with a personage of canonical myth, and it views that personage in two incongruous aspects: Hercules Polli corda subit, promising ipse adero et conamina tanta iuvabo (112); dixit mentemque reliquit (116); he fulfils his promise by taking part personally.

104

ἦμος δ' αἰγυγῆεντα: cf. i.826 cited in next note. αἰγυγῆεντα .. οὐρανόν: first in Alc. PMG 3.66-7 αἰγυγῆ[ε]ντος .. οὐρανῷ, conceivably from an epic model, though Homer has a very small stock of formulaic expressions involving οὐραν(ός) (cf. Page, 230f.) and Hesiod(ea) add nothing that is substantially new (A. Dihle, Homer-Probleme, Opladen 1970, 124). Later examples:—(a) Epithet first: A.R. 4.958-9; [Apolin.] 113.50, both genit. (b) Substantive first: (i) [Orph.] F 168.12 / -ος -ῆεις. (ii) xii.516 / -όν -ῆεντος; claus. ix.9 ~ Or. Sib. 2.36, 11.31. (iii) A.R. 4.615, Triph. 515, Jo. Gaz. 1.183 / -όν -ῆεντα; claus. IG 12(5)739.140 (Andros, i. a?) κατ'... ~ Q. v.131 2v? ... — Q. avoids the only Homeric application of this epithet

(with ὀλύμπου, 3x), but has it in other combinations, none of them novel:-

(i) i.826-7 / ἡμους δ' αἰγληέεα ... / ἡμους ~ A.R. 1.519 / αὐτὰρ οὐτ' αἰγληέεα ... ἡμους / (cf. orac. in AP 14.72.3 Ἠριγένεια). (ii) iv.497 / ἀργύρου - ἑντος : cf. Man. 6.387, Max. 581, orac. in Porph. ap. Eus. PE 5.15; and (iii) v.623 / χρυσόν τ' - ἑντα = Eudoc. Cyp. 2.266, cf. Anon. PMG 927, conj. id. 988.1, Sim. CA 3.1. περιτέφει οὐρανόν : Y has -τέφετ', H -τρέφετ'. The active (Vian) is confirmed by ε 303-4 and viii.52. The terminations -ει / -ετ' are constantly confused in manuscripts, as are τέφ/τρέφ (cf. West's excellent περιτέφεται for -τρέφετ' at Opp. Hal. 3.539: CQ n.s. 13, 1963, 59). For the tense see Bühler, Mosch. Eur. pp. 210-11. οὐρανόν ἄβτρα : cf. ix.66.

105

πάντοθε μαρμαίροντα = (of τεύχη) viii.24, cf. ii.207. μαρμαίρειν is used of the sun at viii.48 (cf. orac. ap. Phleg. Mir. 3.32 [Cougny 294.7] ὄμμασι - οντα /), of the sun's horses xi.331; there is only one early instance of its association with stars (A. Th. 400-1 νύκτα ... ἄβτροισι - ούσαν) but it was probably very commonly so used in later verse: cf. Man. 2.3-4 / ἄβτρα ... / - οντ'; ἄβτροις: D.P. 328-9, Jo. Gaz. 1.182; individual stars: Man. 3.181, 208, Nonn. 47.253 [cf. Peek s.v.]; meteors: Nonn. 2.199. πάντοθε : the first definite attestation of this 'open' form (see 197n.) is Theoc. 17.97, cf. id. 2.122 v.1. Thereafter: Lucill. AP 11.85.2, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.141, Gr. Naz. 760.66, 1318.156; Q., 6 times in all.

106

ῥητορ' Ἀθηναίη : γ 343 (ἐπὶ ἡῶ 344), χ 297. For ῥητορ' after ἡμους δ' (104) cf. ε 560-1, vii.1, 3 etc. μακάρων ἔφος ἀπὸ λιποῦα : certae correctiones. The trouble started, perhaps, with the banalization of ἔφος to γένος (μακάρων γένος is a tag); one might have hoped that somewhere along the line a scribe would have endeavoured to come to grips with the monster ἀμφιλιποῦα — though LSJ accord the word an entry. D wrote originally ἀμφιπολιποῦα, for which see Vian op.cit. (on 75-6 above), 57. μακάρων ἔφος : iii.51; cf. (?) Q 544 Μάκαρος ἔφος v.l. ant. μακάρων. [Peek

manufactures this unit on two occasions in GVI(909.7, 1646.4), whether on any authority, I do not know]. Archaic epic has θεῶν/ἀθανάτων ἔδος of Olympus (cf. Edwards, op. cit. 87 above, 180, adding Scut. 203, expunged by Goettling; for Ἀποῦδα cf. Λ 144; hDem. 341), but note Hes. Th. 128 / ὄφρ' εἴῃ μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἔδος ...; and [Orph.] H. 19.3 / παμμακάρῳ ἔδρανον (~ Call. F 119.1 μακάρων ἔδρανον, in a different sense). ἔδος αἰπὺν Ἀποῦδα: Theoc. 7.115-6 Ἀποόντες / ... ἔδος αἰπὺν Διώνας/.

107f.

The language is strongly Homeric in texture: δ 122 (Helen leaving chamber) / ἦ λυθεν Ἀρτέμιδι .. εἴκυσσά /; η 20-1 (Athene confronting Odysseus) / παρθενικῇ εἴκυσσά νεήνισφι ..., / ὅτῃ δὲ ...; Ψ 65-6 (Patroclus coming to Achilles in his sleep) / ἦ λυθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ ... / πάντ' αὐτῷ ... εἴκυσσά /, 68 ὅτῃ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον εἴειπεν → woodcutting scene.

107

ἄταλάφρονι: for discussion of this much-vexed epithet see C. Moussy, Mélanges ... offerts à P. Chantraine, Paris 1972, 160; Richardson on hDem. 24. ἄταλόφρ — (P⁵¹ M) is unlikely to be right (cf. ἄπαλόφρ — in PM^{VP}) though this spelling is attested in GVI 2026.14 (Thasos, iip.) ἄσμήτην (sc. παρθενικήν) ἄταλόφρονα, and was brilliantly conjectured by Platt in [Orph.] L. 309 (JPh 33, 1914, 268). This hapax Hom., Z 400 / παῖδ' ... ἄταλάφρονα, νηπιον αὐτῷ / (~ AP 1.119.10 ἄταλάφρονας .. παῖδας /) is conjectured in Q. at xiii.122 ἄταλάφρονας ... / νηπιάρχους (Rhodomann: δὲ κατὰ φρένας codd.; δὲ καὶ ἄφρονας cleverly West; closer to the ductus litterarum, but this prefigures what is said in 123b). Cf. further Σ 567 / παρθενικαὶ .. καὶ ἡἰθεοὶ ἄταλὰ φρονέοντες /; λ 39; hDem. 24; Mosch. Eur. 78; vii.340 corr. Lehrs (but see Lloyd-Jones, 274). πάντ' εἴκυσσά: cf. above on 107f., and ii.131 (clausula modified from Λ 613, Ψ 600, δ 654, ω 446); v.527.

108

ἐς νῆας καὶ λαόν: Homer links these nouns in the formula νῆας ... καὶ λαόν — x, reproduced in vii.142. Cf. also vii.416, xiv.245. ἄρηιφίλου ... ἔπειού: for this pattern cf. Γ 430a1. ἄρηιφίλου Μενελάου; and P 10-11

ἄλκι δ' ἄρ' αὖτοῦ / ἔβη, καὶ προσέειπεν ἀρηίφιλον Μενέλαον. ἀρηίφιλον

is interesting. The description of Epeius at iv.327-8 runs:

πολέμου δ' οὐ πάγχυ δαήμων
ἔπλετο λυγρέων, ὅσος ἄρεος ἔβουτο δήρις.

For this tradition see Pfeiffer on Call.F 197.2; there is presumably a reference to the unmartial Epeius in Stesich.SLG 89.9-10. He cuts a different picture here, and cf. xiii.41 (ἑυμμελὴς). In fact, in the episode of the Horse Epeius is no less a chieftain than the others and Athene deals directly with him, not with Odysseus. This is likely to be his original role in the saga: G. Beckel, Götterbeistand in der Bildüberlieferung griechischer Heldensagen, Waldsassen/Bayern 1961, 95.108; Robertson, ABSA 62, 1967, 6f.

109

ἔβη ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς = xiv.181, cf. A.R.4.1350 / ἔβη ὑπὲρ κ. The ultimate model is of course Homer's / ἔβη δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κ., 8 times in a dream-sequence. ἐν δυνείρατι: A.Ch.531 (corr.) ἐν τῷ νείρατι. I know of no evidence for a form δυνείραϊ (odd.), but I should not like to assert that it is impossible. καί μιν λνώγει: cf. E 509, N 329 ὅς (ἦ) μιν λνώγει, A.R.1.47 (τῆς).

110

τεύξαι: see 330(n.); Agath.AP 9.152.4 [Viansino 29] (Epeius) τεύξαι δουρατέων παγίδα/. δούριον ἵππου: xiv.106 δούριος ἵππος/. Not Homeric (ctr.139n.), but it must go back to the cyclic epic (Wackernagel 171f.); Aristarchus' version of λ 526 (cf. Ludwig 1.592) ran: ἐν δ' ἄλλοι πάντες κατὰ δούριον ἵππον Ἀχαιοί. The only other instance of the expression in a hexameter appears to be Lucill.AP 11.259.3.

110-11

ἐγκονέοντι / .. συγκαμῆν: S.Aj.988 ἐγκονεῖ, συγκαμνε.

111

αὐτὴ συγκαμῆν: cf. A.R.1.111 / αὐτὴ ... κάμει, and earlier E 735 Θ 386;

o 105.

112

ἔργον ἐς ἀρπύνορα : codd. offer simplex ordo: for the position of the preposition cf. O⁵⁹(modified i.162) ἀρπύνης μάχην ἐς; for ἐς itself viii.58,xiii.37. θεῆς : Q. has θεῆς 4x, θεή 2x, θεήν 1x, see Vian on v.563(p.209). The form θεή is often impugned by modern critics in a variety of authors, Q. included. Existing surveys (Schneider Call. 1.146; Ardizzone, RFIC 84, 1956, 364f.) are lamentably incomplete for all periods. (A) Archaic period: (i) The new Archilochus, SLG 478.13: θεῆς. (ii) θεῆς is offered by M in hDem. 183, 279, where Richardson adopts θεῆς; but the hyper-Ionism is far less remarkable than e.g. the Hesiodic σίη, Μαίη, cf. West, Hes. Th. p.80. (B) Later examples, in descending order of frequency: θεῆς : Call., see Pfeiffer Index s.v.; Alex. Aet. CA 4.7; A.R. 3.252, 4.241; Nic. Ther. 16; Man. 2.317; Triph. 57 +3; Musae. 55 +2; anonyma: 'Sim.' HE 3312; (epic) PSI 1386.32; EpGr. 1046a2, p.xxiii Kaibel (Hermione, iip.?); SEG 11.304.1 (Argos, iip.). θεή : Antim. F 186; Call., Pfeiffer Index; Mel. HE 4/96; Antist. GPh 1105; EpGr. 1046.51 Kaibel (Rome, iip.); Triph. 649; orac. in Cougny, AppAnth. 201.3, p.505. θεήν : A.R. 3.549; Rhian. HE 3240; D.P. 828; Anon. EpGr. 5899 Page. θεήν : Nic. Ther. 487; orac. in Cougny, 197.2, p.504. μῦθον ἀκούας : Homeric clausula (4x; ἀκούας 2x), also [Hes.] F 165.4, 280.24; Parm. F 2.1, 23.11; [Theoc.] 25.162; Nonn. Met. 1.206, 11.14, D. 33.283.

113

καυχαιόων ἀνὰ θυμόν : sim. Christod. 173-4 ἐνὶ θυμῷ / -όων, cf. xiv.232; iii.136=xiv.403; iii.200 ~ ix.527. καυχαιόων ... ἐκθορεν: cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 1.523 καυχαιόων .. θόρεν, id. 4.110, 363. ἐκθορεν ὕπνου : so in a dream-sequence Nonn. 34.99-100 ἐξ ὕπνου θόρε ἐνδύγεν . ἐκδύσκεν is commonly so used in late prose, e.g. Philostr. Her. 1.10. For the form cf. Π 427 ἐκθορε δῖφρου /, Claud. Gig. (2) 70 πόντου /.

114

ἔγνω δ' ...: cf. α 420 ἀδινάτην θεὸν ἔγνω /; Or. Sib. 3.693 γνώσονται θεὸν ἀμβροτον, Procl. H. 4.7 γνοίην θεὸν ἀμβροτον. ἀθάνατος θεὸν ἀμβροτον: the same combination in Carm. Aur. 71 ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἀμβροτος. Archaic epic

has / λ^2 δάνατον θεόν (Φ 380- Λ 464), θεὸν ἄμβροτον (χ 9[α νδρ'...],
 ω 445; [Hes.] F 240.10).

114-5

α νδρ'.... ὠρμαίνε: cf. K 93 α νδρ'μοι ἦτορ /; σ 344-5 α ἴλλα δέ σ' κῆρ /
 ω ρμαίνε (δ ρμ- edd.).

115

α ἴλλο παρέξ: Emp. F 7.6; elsewhere in the verse A. R. 3.1051, cf. id. 3.195 (α νδρ'
 .. παρέξ .. α ἴλλο), [Mosch.] Meg. 125 (μ ηδ' α ἴλλο παρέκ). The prototype
 is the Homeric (/) α ἴλλα παρέξ, δ 348 etc. νόον... ἔργω: perhaps
 Q. had in mind here Hes. Op. 444-5 ἐπὶ ἔργω / θυμὸν ἔχων; cf. Thgn. IEG 461
 ἐπ' ἀπρήκτοισι νόον ἔχε, and for αἶν id. 1149. αἶν ἐπ' ἔργω: so
 (Golega 72) [Apolin.] 108.39, cf. Gr. Naz. 1376.331 (ἐργοῖς). ἐπ' ἔργω:
 infr. 132 ν iii.377; Theoc. 15.20; [Apolin.] 68.48al.; Anon. APL 84.1. Early
 epic has ἐπὶ ἔργω / — οἰς /, but also (Hes. Th. 146) ἐπ' ἔργω οἰς /, of which
 there is one Alexandrine example (A. R. 4.411) and some 23 thereafter. The
 ἐπ' form on the other hand is very rare after the archaic period: sing.:
 ν . 6, 49, cf. Julius GDK 20.2.2, epigr. ap. Zonar. 13.13, verse 2; ~~plur.~~ plur.: Max.
 543, EpGr. 909a³ Kaibel (Nisaea, ivp.?).

116

θεσπεσίω: because backed by Athene. περὶ φρένας ἦϊε: cf. in general
 ν 228 τοῖ πινυτῇ φρένας ἴκει/. περὶ here denotes the 'swamping' of the
 soul or intelligence, as perhaps in xiv.152 Κύπρις πεπότητο περὶ φρένας.
 The ancestors of these expressions are K 139 τὸν δ' αἰψα περὶ φρένας
 ἦλυθ' ὠρή /, ϵ 362 Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἦλυθεν σῖνος / (used by Lucian to
 lend an air of mock-solemnity in AP 9.367.7: Θήρωνα περὶ φρένας ἦλυθε
 πλοῦτος /), cf. Λ 89, hAp. 461. In all of these the acc. person is expressed
 or (Λ 89 ν μιν 88) implied, and φρένας is acc. of respect, περὶ adv. or
 in tmesis. (The grammatical status of περὶ με φρένας is obscure in the
 lacunose Alcm. PMG 3.1, cf. Page, CR n.s. 9, 1959.16; Barrett, Gnomon 33, 1961,
 684). Q. evidently understood differently: ii.261 πατρὶ περὶ φρένας ἦλυθε
 πένθος / (cf. [Orph.] A. 1329; the acc. has to be corrected to a dat. in the

eccentric lines id.777-8);iv.208 αἶψα γὰρ χάρμα περὶ φρένας ἡ'λυθε πάντων/;
xiv.80 Ἐάνδοιο περὶ φρένας ἡ'λυθεν ἄλγος /;ii.615 Κρονίδαο περὶ φρένας
ἄλγος ἴκηται / (cf. Arat.473 τοι .. περὶ φρένας ἴκετο θαῦμα /; but acc.
[Orph.] A.1158 θαῦτος .. περὶ φρένας ἴκετο πάντας/, without person express-
ed id.787 περὶ φρένας ἴκετο δαίμα /). πινυτή ... τέχνη : Christod.412
πινυτήν ... τέχνην /.

117

ἀπώλαμένη : dawn 'chases away' (διώκειν) the stars (E. Ion 1158) and night
(Nonn.34.104). Roman poets have a vast battery of verbs to express this
notion. A detailed study of formal Zeitangaben in Q. and co. in relation
to Alexandrine and Roman poetry is an urgent desideratum. κνέφας
ἡ'ύ : κνέφας is ἱερόν in Homer (A 194al.); cf. ii.478 φάος ἡ'ύ .. ἡελίοιο /
✓ A.R.4.1019 ἱερόν φάος ἡελίοιο /, Hes. Op.339, Q.i.77; i.184 ἱερόν ἡ'ύ,
'holy temple', as (e.g.) νηόν .. ἱάθεον (vi.146, xiii.435), ἱερόν .. νηόν
(A.R.3.915).

118

εἰς Ἔρεβος : so κ 528, Hes. Th.515, hDem.335, Or. Sib.1.116. Night is con-
signed to the subterranean gloom of Erebus (whence she is summoned by the
chorus in E. Or.176), child of Chaos: cf. xiv.2; ii.612f.; West on Hes. Th.116,
123. χαροπή : a survey of modern explanations of this word in Glotta
36, 1958, 189 (Georgacas). Cf. here A.R.1.1280 (ἡ'ώς); of the moon in x.337,
cf. Arat.1152, Gow on Theoc.12.35. δι' ἡ'έρος : = 288; frequent in Q., as
in A.R., note in particular 3.1358 (αἶγλη 1357).

119

θεῶν ὄνειρον : an Homeric combination: B 22, 56; Σ 495. The epicising
Aeschylus employs the expression in Ar. Ra.1340; it found a home in a magic
hymn (GDK 59.8.10) and in a Christian narrative (Gr. Naz.10C2.429).

119-20

ὄνειρον ἔειπεν : cf. Σ 495 ~ 497; B 80 ὄνειρον ... ἐνίσπε / (ἴδεν
82) ~ [Orph.] A.560-1; and, for ἐν Ἀργ., ..., the formula μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν
ἔειπεν / (8 times in Ψ).

ὥς ἴδεν, ὥς ἠ'κούβεν : Q. dispenses with the need for direct speech (and possible repetition) exactly in the manner of HDem. 171-2 ὥκα δὲ μητρὶ / ἔννεπον ὥς εἶδον τε καὶ ἔκλνον. For the double ὥς, 'telling how', cf. AP 1.119.24 /ὥς θά'νεν, ὥς ... ῥῆξε ...; for the form, the syntactically different Theoc. 3.42 /ὥς ἴδεν, ὥς ἐμάνη, Bion F 1.40, Colluth. 255 which go back to 294, cf. the variant recorded by Eust. at V 424. (For discussion and bibliogr. see Livrea on Colluth. loc. cit. The following should be added: Matro Conv. 89; Gr. Naz. 1000.411; [Apolin.] 96.8). ἐλδομένοισιν ἔειπεν : iv. 82, xiv. 337; A.R. 3.522 has μετέειπεν ἐλδομένοισιν.

Audience-reaction to a dream report is identical in Sil. 4.739: laetam numine pubem... στ^c : equivalent to a gen., as often in Q. (Vian*); not 'a mere cheville' as I originally labelled it. εἰς αἰὶντες : first in Sapph. PLF 5.13, 62.7. A Lieblingswort of A.R., it is found occasionally in other Alexandrine poets (Livrea on A.R. 4.584; but AP 9.189.6 [=EpGr. 5902 Page] looks late; add Antip. Sid. HE 284), and is widespread thereafter, particularly in Christian verse (e.g. Gr. Naz. 7x; Nonn. Met. 11x; [Apolin.] 9x). In Q. again infr. 576 (for the clausula cf. A.R. 4.1363), ii. 64 (cf. A.R. 4.1184), vii. 432 (variation on A.R. 2.408), viii. 450 (-1: cf. A.R. 2.194, 1085, 4.584f., 1363¹; Opp. Hal. 3.292-3; Nonn. 18.172), ix. 422, x. 45 (cf. A.R. 4.1363), xiii. 57 (cf. viii. 450 supr.). 2περὲς ἰὸν κεύθροντο = v. 94, cf. xi. 385-6. Adverbial 2περὲς ἰὸν, absent in Homer, abounds in Q.; particularly of the emotions: cf. ii. 179, iii. 180, vii. 542; iii. 205, x. 355.

122-156

(A) Woodcutting and (B) Horse-building.

(A)

The sparse summary of Il. Parv. (222f.) supplies no details on the construction of the Horse, but Ida will obviously have been the source of the material: Euripides talks of 'mountain pine' (Tr. 533) and Ida is specified by [Apollod.] 5.14; cf. also Petr. 4f., Triph. 59f. (with similar phrasing),

and Stat.Silv.1.1.10. This detail is absent in both Virgil(A.2.15f.) and Dictys(5.9).

Here(and, to a lesser extent, in iii.672f., v.618f.) Q. makes some use of the elaborate Iliadic woodcutting scene: Ψ 109f. dawn; 110f. Agamemnon οὐρανὸς τ' ὄτρυνε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀξέμεν ὕλην (cf. ἡμιότων 121); 114 they employ πέλλεκες; 118-20 δρυὶ ὑψικόμοις.. χαλκῷ/τάμνον .. καὶ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέοντα/πῆπτον' τὰς μὲν ἔπειτα διαπρήσσοντες [see 130n.] Ἀχαιοί... ~ 144f. prayer of Achilles, Nonnos(37.7f.) paints a similar picture: 8-9 πρῶτος ἡμιόνοισι καὶ .. ἀνδρῶν ἐκέλευεν ἄγειν .. ὕλην; 14(sim.15) ἐτέμετο δένδρα σιδηρῷ; 16 ὑψιπέτηλος ἐπέκτυπε κοπτομένη δρυὶ; 19 ἐγμνῶθῃσαν ἐρίπναι; 31f. ἐπὶ πνυσον .. ὁ μὲν κτλ.

Woodcutting scenes did not begin and end with Homer, and Q. will be incorporating details from other sources³². Greek models are thin on the ground, but Roman specimens can throw a faint light on Q.:-

125-6: Enn.Ann.196-7 sonabat/arbustum ~ Virg.A.6.180 sonat icta securibus [v.infr.] ilex, A.11.135-6 ferro sonat alta bipenni/fraxinus ~ Sil.10.

529-30 sonat acta bipenni/..silva alta.

126-7: Ov.Ep.16.109(departure of Paris) ardua..spoliantur Gargara silvis.

128: ὄρηες : cf. Virg.A.6.179; Stat.Theb.6.97.

130: Enn.Ann.193 securibus caedunt.

135f.: cf. Stat.Silv.4.3.50f.

Both Virgil(A.6) and Silius follow up with a prayer.

(B)

The building of the Horse³³ is described extensively by Triph. also(62-102; in his footsteps, Tz.Posth.635f., a less than half-hearted account). It may be that Triph. borrows details from Q., or vice-versa. It seems to me however that it is time to stop regarding these ten-a-penny productions with unadulterated or even tempered awe: we are all indebted to Τύχη, but we are not her slaves. If one were to lock away a Greek of the fourth century with a modest set of Troica and ask him, never having set eyes on Q.'s poem, to draft a version of Cassandra's opposition to the Horse, there is a very strong chance that she would emerge equipped with,

among other attributes, 'virgin modesty'. Again, if we were suddenly presented with two or three dozen imperial epic poems, how would we then view the relationship of Q. with, say, Nonnos, a man who could pen $\eta\theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\ \alpha\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon$ $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\tau\alpha\ \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\mu\mu\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma\ \text{Αφροδίτη}$? If Triph.--Nonn.--Colluth. and their kind represented the 'avant-garde' school of hexametric composition (which they surely did), then there must have been as wide a gulf separating them from Q. and his brand of writing as that which separated Callimachus from the hack Homer-worshippers. Dislike does not necessarily preclude dependence. Still, we ought to ask ourselves how far it is legitimate to make wide-ranging generalisations on the basis of the few disiecta membra of post-Alexandrine epic now available to us.

The two accounts are not in fact particularly close. Both poets agree in specifying certain parts of the animal's anatomy, unavoidably: Horses are Horses. The order of construction is quite different, and the only obvious linguistic correspondence is Triph. 80 $\nu\tilde{\omega}\tau\alpha\ \dots\ \epsilon\upsilon\nu\eta\rho\mu\omicron\epsilon\ \sim$ Q. 140, but cf. the notes on 140 and 142. While Q.'s Horse sounds (despite assertions to the contrary) a featureless lump of wood³⁴, Triph.'s is gaudy and flamboyant. Q. contents himself with saying that the Horse looked full of life (146, cf. 149f.), Triph. makes the same point in more pictorial ways (74, 79, 85f.). Lastly, Q. confines himself here to the bare essentials of the Horse's physique: we have to wait for the door (331), the ladder (333), the wheels (424f.); cfr. Triph. 90, 100.

122-3

Euripides could make a rhetorical point about Ida's wealth of trees (Hipp. 1252-4, where see Barrett), Theocritus refers to it with great effect in an encomiastic setting (17.9f.), and it reaches the level of an adynaton-subject in Ov. Met. 13.324f. The mountain was denuded of its trees with gay abandon throughout the Trojan War, cf. the complaints of the chorus in Sen. Tro. 73f.

122

καὶ ... ἡἶες : cf. A. R. 3.196 / καὶ τοῖς ἔρ' ἡἶας Ἐριξοῦ. In Homer the

unit /καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρ' is very often followed by a proper name: so iv.585, xi.129, 289; A.R. 2.118, 3.1225. Ἄτρεός υἱος: Homer has in this sedes Ἀ. υἱέ' (B 23 etc. cf. vi.41), υἱόν (Γ 37 etc.). Elsewhere in Q. the repeated Ἀ. υἱε κραταιῷ / (vi.502, 516). ὧς ἄλγεα: Ω has lost either ες (R^{sl} and Rhodomann, cf. υἱος; ix.162 εἰς ἄλγεα) or ἄν' (cf. i.626, ii.382, vii.715). ἄλγεα τηλεθρόντα: similar in form to v196 (δένδρεα).

τηλεθρόντα: -θρόντα L. At iv.424, ix.198 -θρόντ- codd.; but i.399, 490 -όωντα; ii.537 -όωσαν. There are variations in the manuscript tradition of Homer (note esp. η114 [with v.l.] ~ v196; η116 [with v.l.], cf. K. Meister, Die homerische Kunstsprache, Leipzig 1921, 65f.) as elsewhere (e.g. A.R. 4.1425, cf. id. 1.29 test.; D.P. 836, 1079; [Orph.] A. 1134).

123

Ἰδης ψικρόμοιο: Ξ293 begins Ἰδης ψ(ηλῆς). The adjective was suggested by the δρῦς ψικρόμοις of Ψ118. It is used of tree-clad mountains in hHom. εἰς Ξέωνος 3, Asius F8.1 Kinkel, cf. Or. Sib. 8.16; in archaic epic exclusively of the oak, as at i.618: but with ἐλάτῃσι v.119 (~ E. Alc. 585-6).

123-4

θοοὺς ... ἄνδρας: perhaps a recollection of A.R. 1.640-1 προέηκαν / .. κήρυκε θοοὺν; i.341 θοοὶ ... ἄνδρες in a different sense. προέηκαν .. ἄνδρας: cf. Γ118-9; [Orph.] A. 1211 ἀποπροέηκε μόλειν .. εταίρους /; and (in a similar scene) iii.676 / Ἄτρεΐδαι προέηκαν .. σῶόμεν (~ θ 399 = σ 291, cf. μ 9-10). The clausula has parallels in Homer: προέηκε πυθέσθαι, πέτεσθαι, φέρεσθαι once apiece.

124

ἐλάτῃσιν: tradition supplies some detail on the material used for the Horse. Euripides (Tr. 533) talks of πέλικα. In Virgil (A. 2.16 ~ Prop. 4.1.42) abies is used, though it is not quite clear how he envisaged the total structure (Sinon refers to acer in 112 [cf. [Ov.] Ib. 569?]; 258f. pinea.. / lexat claustra Sinon: 'inconsistencies' in Homeric descriptive epithets, adduced by McLeod, Phoenix 24, 1970, 144f., provide no basis of comparison here). Pausanias tells of κρόνεια, 3.13.5, see Frazer there. ἄν'
ὧς ἄλγεα: ii.383. All the other instances are Alexandrine: A.R. 4.1338, Nic.

Ther.499; Ἰλιν :Theoc.1.116,14.43;Diosc.HE 1591.

125

τάμνον δένδρεα μακρά : Λ88(τάμνων), βῆ66 ἡ6ιν 87. The Homeric tag δένδρεα μακρά is used extensively by ω.

125-6

μακρά bis:521-2n. περικτυπέοντο ... θεινόμενων :cf.viii.273-4 περὶ δ'
ἐκτυπεν ... / θεινόμενα ;viii.179-80 ἐπικτυπέουσι δὲ βῆ66αι [=i.698] /
μαρναμένων, with variations in ii.383;x.368. Line 125 is founded on the
Iliadic sequence δρυῖ ... / τάμνον .. τὰ δὲ .. κτυπέουσαι /...(Ψ 118-9).

126

ἱκρία codd.: it is easy to think of a word close to the ductus litterarum
(ἑκρία dub.Vian; κατὰ δρία West; or κατὰ ρία), but Rhodomann's οὔρεα
(damaged by the following -κρεα, then Homeric contamination, one of a host
of alarming examples in this poem: Ο676 ἱκρι' .. μακρά, μ229 μακρ' ...
ἱκρία) is by far the likeliest conjecture: cf.xiii.490 δοιχαὶ δὲ περιβρομέουσι
κολῶναι / of an ὄρος clad λαδύησιν ... ἑλγης (488 ~ infr.132); iv.240 ~
ἐν ὄρεσσι 238; vii.258-9 (leg. μακρά!); vii.401; viii.339. — κατ' οὔρεα
μακρά again i.315, v.17, xiii.73, conjectured by West(258) at ii.352; =
Theoc.1.123, 8.2(οὔρεα); [Apolin.] 77.119. The components are Homeric,
cf. Φ 485 and N18. κολῶναι may well have been a standard detail in
this woodcutting scene: cf. vertices in Petr.4.

127

δεύοντ' ἐκ ζυλόχοιο : ἐκ is hard (harder than any of the examples adduced
by Koechly, v.495-6 etc.) and perhaps we should read with Tychsen δεύοντο
ζυλόχοιο ; ἐκ ζυλ. from Homer, Λ415 etc., cf. vi.342. νάπη δ' ἀνεφαίνετο
could be a reminiscence of the pictorial Θ557-8= Π299-300 / ἐκτ' ἔφανεν
.... νάπαι . ἀνεφαίνετο παῖδα : similarly v169 πρὸς φαίνετο παῖδα /,
cf. N 13.

128

θηρέειν : cf. Homer's μητέρα θηρῶν (Ida is reportedly still so, J.M.Cook,
The Troad, Oxford 1973, 306), and Nic. Alex. 38f., Catul. 63.53, Culex 311. We
hear more in antiquity of Ida's trees and springs than of its wild life.

ὡς τὸ παροῖθεν :Homer has (β 312) ἄν ὡς τὸ π., where ὡς bears a different sense, cf. Nonn. 20.399 and Svensson, 116; ctr. A.R. 1.816, 3.526; Rhian. (?) POxy. 2883.i.2; Or. Sib. 2.176; Nonn. Met. 6.208 (/ οὐκέτι ...); clausul.:- A.R. 4.884, 1068; GVI 2040.7 (Pergamon, i-ii) and 1166.20 (Smyrna, iii); SEG 16.341. 7 (Delphi, iv); Gr. Naz. 1355.23 (/ μηκέθ' ...) +4; ii.340 (οὐκέτι ...), v.148 (οὐδ' ἐτι ...). The fact that τὸ παροῖθεν is far commoner in Q. than τὸ παρὸς / πρὶν indicates for Svensson (87) Apollonian influence: maybe, but an imperial poet must be viewed against his own background, not against a selection of 'classical' writers.

129

The defoliated stumps actually yearn nostalgically for the violent wind. Trees rarely exhibit emotions in detachment from their Hamadryads, but compare Pantelius GDK 23.7-8 δένδρον δ' ὡς ἔβηκε σιδηρείῃς ὑπὸ ρίπτεις / κοῦκ ἐθέλει πεσεῖν, and, apud Romanos, Ov. Met. 10.374 (tree hewn by axe 'hesitates' which way to fall), Stat. Ach. 2.61 (Paris cuts down pines on Ida that are 'afraid' [veritas, v.l. vetitas: Dilke ad loc. aptly compares Silv. 2.6.27f.] to fall to the ground), and, most striking of all, id. Theb. 8.545f. (falling trees sorrow; the elm 'unwillingly' crushes the grapes).

βίην .. ἀνέμοιο :Homer has the formula βίης ἀνέμων ἀλεεῖν / Π 213, Ψ 713; Q. offers one of his own: iii.508 βίη μεγάλῳ ἀνέμοιο / sim. v.388; vi.330. In making both nouns singular Q. differs from Homer and from everyone else: Opp. Hal. 2.226; Gr. Naz. 984.187; [S.] F 1126.3 [late forgery].

130

καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄρ :cf. B 425 (note the context); Nic. Ther. 562; i.400a1. διατμήγοντες Ἀχαιοί :at Ψ 120 τὰς μὲν ἔπειτα διατμήγοντες Ἀχαιοί / one of three variant readings is διατμήγοντες (on these see Ludwig 1.484, 572; La Roche 341-2). Cf. P 520 ~ 522.

131

ἐπ' ἠόνας Ἑλλησπόντων = ii.353, xiii.64, cf. infr. 353 = iv.81, ix.172 ἐπ' ἠόβιν Ἑ./, iii.4, 391 παρ' ἠόβιν Ἑ./ . Side by side with the Homeric ἠόβες (10x) Q. has this contracted form also at ix.434 παρ' ἠόβιν ; iii.767 ἐπ' ἠόνας ; vii.241, xii.278 πρὸς ἠόνας, i.323 ποτὶ .. ἠόνα . It is employed in 'epic'

hexameters also by [Orph.] A.562, Nonn. D. passim, but it had become established in other types of hexameter long before. First in a lyric passage of Euripides, Or. 994 (cf. Trag. Adesp. F 191 Nauck; Lyc. 244, 330, 1368; Ezech. F 128.31 Snell; also [Scym.] 821, Babr. 6.1), it is found in Alexandrine pastoral (Theoc. 16.60, cf. [Mosch.] 3.37, 122, [Bion] 2.3) and epigram (e.g. Diosc. HE 1710; also later epigram), and in various other genres of hexameter: Or. Sib. 1.260, 5.322, 453; D.P. 575; Opp. Hal. 1.180al.; [Opp.] Cyn. 4.257; Nonn. Met. 21.20al.; Christod. 409. Parallels for Q.:- (i) $\alpha\rho' \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\nu$: [Mosch.] 3.37; orac. ap. Cougny 298.1; Nonn. D. 47.406, Met. 21.20; Christod. 409. (ii) $\epsilon\pi' \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\nu \lambda\psi\iota\nu\theta\sigma\iota\omicron$ / D.P. 575. (iii) $\epsilon' \pi' \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$: Opp. Hal. 3.64al., [Opp.] Cyn. 4.257. (iv) $\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$, $\pi\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\ldots \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\alpha$: cf. Trag. Adesp. F 191 Nauck $\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \eta\acute{o}\delta\iota\alpha$.

132

$\alpha' \rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\kappa \lambda\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$: so acutely, and surely rightly, Vian, for $\lambda\iota\varsigma \epsilon\zeta \delta' \rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$. For the form cf. Germ. AP 9.17.1 / $\alpha' \rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\zeta \delta\pi\lambda\tau\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$, and, e.g., xi.378, xiv.225. $\lambda. \delta' \rho\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (x.332 $\lambda\alpha\delta\iota\eta\varsigma \dots \text{'I}\delta\eta\varsigma$ /) is late (A.R. 3.581 $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\eta\varsigma$) : viii.131 / $\alpha' \rho\epsilon\omicron\iota\nu \epsilon\nu \lambda\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\nu \sim$ [Orph.] L.442 $\lambda\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\nu \epsilon\nu \alpha' \rho\epsilon\omicron\iota\nu$; x.452 $\lambda\alpha\delta\iota\omega\nu \delta' \rho\epsilon\omega\nu =$ [Apolin.] 113.8, 12. $\mu\acute{o}\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon \delta\epsilon \delta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$: the pattern (VERB:) $\upsilon - \upsilon \delta\epsilon \delta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma \upsilon - \chi$ is infrequent: cf. Ψ 370 \sim A.R. 4.1126 \sim iii.377 ($\epsilon\pi' \epsilon' \rho\gamma\gamma$ /). $\epsilon\pi' \epsilon' \rho\gamma\gamma$: 115n.

133

$\alpha\iota\varsigma\eta\omega\nu$: the basic meaning of $\alpha\iota\varsigma\eta\omega\varsigma$ (a mysterious word: bibliogr. in R. Schmitt, Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos, Wiesbaden 1970, 130; cf. Pisani, ZVS 88, 1974, 106f.) seems to be 'a mature adult' (see A.R. 4.461, opp. $\lambda\epsilon\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$) who is capable of engaging in strenuous or dangerous activities. This is the usual, perhaps the only, meaning in Homer, but at E 92 schol. explain as $\lambda\iota\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ (comparing Π 392), and μ 440 (a passage that prompted Bechtel [20] to exclaim: 'der Verfasser des Verses wusste wol nicht, was er tat') may well have been taken in the same way (but schol. Q paraphrase with $\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\nu$). $\alpha\iota\varsigma\eta\omega\iota$ is no doubt the equivalent of $\lambda\iota\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ infr. 295 ($\sim \lambda\iota\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ 292; but note the context), ix.502, and perhaps elsewhere in Q. For earlier examples see Gow-Page on Theodorid. HE 3573; Schneider Call. 1.157.

133, 135f.

Cf. E. Hec. 572-3 ... εἶχεν πόλον, ἀλλ' οἷ μὲν κτλ.

134

<ω> ἀλλοθεν ἀλλος : something like ἀθρόσι (cf. vii. 113-4) has dropped out.

Scarcella's ἄχ' ἐτλ' οἱ [518] demonstrates that it is perfectly possible to write worse poetry than our Calabrian. ἀλλοθεν ἀλλος : cf. vii. 542 [viii. 228 f.l.]; in this sedes also B 75, / 671, and (e.g.) Arat. 146, Alex. Eph. 1 (Meineke, p. 372), [Orph.] A. 231, Nonn. 36.403. σποδρήβοντες : first and once only in Alexandrine verse, in the contextually similar A.R. 3.274, but popular later: Kost's long list on Musae. 143 still requires supplementation: Man. 3.328, MAMA 6.15 (Phrygia, iii), Anon. ethop. POxy. 3002.20 (iv?), conj. Colluth. 69; Christians: epigr. ap. Malal. 13p. 325 Bonn., v. 3 (a. 341); Gr. Naz. 440. 16, 500.25; [Apolin.] 80.13, 118.168, 148.18; Paul. Sil. Eophr. 514.

135-6

Traditional terminology no doubt, cf. Triph. 59 τέμνετο δούρα. Homer has (€ 162, for raft; cf. A.R. 2.1187-8, Argo) δούρατα .. ταμῶν .. χαλκῶ /, and the chief model here (Ψ 118-9) χαλκῶ / ταμῶν. For βιδήρω cf. Hes. Op. 420; Nonn. 2.67, 37.38; 37.14. ὀκρίοντι : a similar correction is required at [Orph.] L. 527. Man. 3.70 writes κρυδόντι βιδήρω /, but Canter's ὀπὸ κρυδόντι here wins no support from Q.'s own usage: cf. i. 259a1.

136

ἀνιδεῖς : cf. xiii. 42 (corr.). ἀπ' ὀφθονς : so hAphr. 271 (ὀφθ' οἱ), Theoc. 15.122, Anon. AP 9.209.1 (-ω, -ον).

137

ἀπρίετων : here only in verse, but πρίετας Hom.

138

ἀλλος δ' ἀλλο' [=vi. 364] τι ρέει : an echo of B 400 / ἀλλος δ' ἀλλω [~ viii. 324] ἐρείει ... The juxtaposition of two cases of ἀλλος at the beginning of the verse, found occasionally in Homer, is widespread among later poets (e.g. [Theoc.] 25.50, Nonn. 4.460), Q. included (cf. the 'battle formula' of vi. 642, viii. 108, xi. 121; xiv. 142 is a close imitation of θ 516).

ἀντάρ = η 208. ἀντάρ ἔπειός: for the pattern ἀντάρ + proper name (shape: υ—υ), especially common at line-end, see Ruijgh 40f. Other examples in Q.: xi.86 Ἀγνήνωρ /, and the Homeric Ἀθήνη / (1x), Ἀχαιοί / (2x), Ὀδυσσεύς / (1x). Cf. here Ψ 694 ἀντάρ.. ἔπειός / [so, at any rate, the vulgate: Ruijgh (46) argues persuasively for an original ἀτάρ (which is a variant); cf. also Jacobsohn 207], and N 691 ἀντάρ ἔπειών /.

138-9

For ἀντάρ in close succession cf. e.g. γ 298-9.

139

ἵππου δουρατέοιο = xiii.40, cf. infr. 394 /—ον—εον, Triph. 458 /—ω—έω. ἀντάρ ἔπειτα was the phrase that the epigrammatist Pollianus picked on to typify Homericising poets: τὸν κυκλίον τούτους, τὸν ἀντάρ ἔπειτα λέγοντας, / μιδῶ, λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων (AP 11.130; see Morel, RhM 105, 1962, 190). According to Ruijgh (37, q.v. for later examples) 52x in Il. / Od. (26x claus.). Oddly enough, Q. offers only four further examples: claus. iii.758; ἔνν ἀντ... ii.135, viii.111, 472.

140

νηδύα : —ύα forms in Q. and others are listed in Wernicke 290f., La Roche, WS 22, 1900, 51-2. συνήρμοσε : 142n.; Triph. 80 / νῶτα .. ὁμοῦ λαγόνε 661 συνήρμοσε.

140-1

νῶτα πάρος : cf. A.R. 4.1349, 1611 νῶτα καὶ ἰζύας, 3.1320-1 νῶτα / ἔξόπιθεν; Π 611 P 527 / πρόβω ... ἔξόπιθεν...

141

καθύπερθε δὲ χαίτην : after δ 150 ἐφύπερθέ τε χαίται /.

142

αἰχέλιος ὑψηλοῖο : [Apolin.] 151.16 / αἰχέλιος ὑψηλοῖο κα— (cf. Golega 73). The Horse is labelled ὑψηλός in Triph. 104. καθήρμοσεν : perhaps an indication of a tragic model, however remote: καθάρμοσεν Eur. 3x (and Rh. 2x); so συναρμόσεν (140) 4x. ὥς ἔτεόν περ : cf. ≡ 125 vulg., vii.726, infr. 510 codd.; in an ecphrasis: A.R. 1.763; v.24, 84, vi.221, 280.

143

ἁλίοιον ... καὶ ...:cf.xi.471(= [Theoc.] 25.257) ἁλίοιο καρχήατος, xiv.
579 καρχή ἁλίοιον τε γένειον/; and for the form A.R.1.1312 λαχνήεν τε καρχή
καὶ ... ἁλίοιον τε Pauw and, independently, West, perhaps rightly; 'post illud
ὡς ἔτεον ... novo quasi impetu cetera persequitur' Koechly, who however
accepts τ' [Tychsen] for δ' in 144, where see Vian.

144

οὐάτα ... τε :but ὀφθαλμοί τε καὶ οὐάτα v365. στειθεάς :like διαυγής
(cf. Gow-Page on Philitt.HE 3024f.), 'bright', 'sparkling'. ἄλλα τε πάντα
5n. Q. habitually cuts short lists with an 'etcetera':e.g.iii.692f.(items
sacrificed on Achilles' pyre),v.97f.(features of Achilles' shield:ctr. Σ
606-7),v.635f.(pyre of Ajax),vi.292f.(shield of Eurypylus).

145

ᾧς ἐπικίνυται ἵππος :cf.xiii.245 μελέων δπόδοις ἐ<π>κίνυτ(αι) ἀνὴρ/,
a vexed line decisively emended by Vian;I have not noticed this compound
elsewhere. Q. appears to be aware of the mobility of certain parts of the
Horse's anatomy(see Timpanaro,SUCC 31,1957,156f.;Austin on Virg.A.2.150).
ῥέξετο ...:suggested by Θ66a1. ῥέξετο ἱερὸν ῥήμαρ/ and §66 τόδε ἔργον
ῥέξεται. Similar are v.59,viii.280.

146

Q. declares that motifs on the shield of Achilles look lifelike with tire-
some insistence(v.13,42,68,cf.x.185);but he is treading a well-worn path,
cf.e.g. Σ 539,Scut.189,194,Sil.2.430. ὡς ἔτεον :so,in an ecphrasis,
v.90,x.194(πεποτῆτο cf.Nonn.25.33);accompanied by a participle:Nonn.34.
302;in a different sense:Opp.Hal.1.649. ῥώντος :similarly vii.726-7.

146-7

ἔπει ... ἐρατήν :cf. H 288-9 ἔπει τοι δῶκε θεοὶ πινυτήν; η 35
ἔπει .. δῶκε; α 292 β 223 ἀνέρι .. δῶναι (δῶκε)/;and Opp.Hal.2.15-
16 τέχνας .. ἀνδρώποισιν ^{δῶκεν} /sc.θεοί. τέχην/.. ἐρατήν :here only. One
may recall the ἐμερτὴ σοφίη of poets gifted by the Muses,Sol.IEG 13.52.

147

Our only estimate of work-time; ε 262 (Odysseus' raft) τέτρατον ἡμῶν ἔην
καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο πάντα. ἐνὶ τριδὶν ἡμέραι : Metrod. AP 14.130.2 ἐν
τριδὶν ἡμέραιν — x. ἐνί is a conjecture: ἐπὶ codd., and so Tz. Posth.
114. Perhaps one ought to be careful about changing ἐπὶ to ἐνί in late
poetry: cf. Max. 347 ἐπὶ πρώτῃ ἡορῇ (ἐνί West, Philologus 110, 1966, 166),
[Orph.] A. 732 ἐπὶ (sense: ἐνί) codd. Further investigation seems req-
uired.

148

Παλλὰς ἐνεβίησε : 4n. πολὺν... λαόν : cf. iv. 147 πολὺν δ' ἀμφιάχε
λαόν /, v. 651 ~ ∫ 164; slightly differently [Hes.] F 75.11; Scut. 475, see
Solmsen there. ἐπεγῆθεε : at A. Fr. 157 ἐπεγῆθει is often rejected in
favour of Elmsley's ἐγεγῆθει, but the preverb is desirable and Murray's
comment 'vocem non ante Oppianum inventam', if it did not sound quaint
then, must surely do so now. The compound appears from time to time in
the post-Alexandrine era: imperf.: 439 infr., ii. 460, xiii. 126; Nonn. 40.311;
aor.: Opp. Hal. 1.570, 5.633; [Apolin.] 34.51, 84.12.

149

θυμὸς : 'life', or better 'mettle', cf. Harrison, CR n.s. 3, 1953, 139; Stat. Silv.
1.1.46-7 (description of equestrian statue of Domitian) sonipes...animos..
imitatus equestris/...cursum...minatur.

150

τόχος .. ποδῶν : S. Aj. 814. ἐκπεπότητο : x. 280, adduced by Vian, is un-
helpful here; so are E. El. 176-7, vii. 262, and the passages cited by Gow on
Theoc. 2.19. It would be doing this jejune description no real disservice
to read ἐκπεπότητο (cf. Wyss on Antim. F 39, and vi. 241, vii. 202) with
Rhodomann and Zimmermann: but Triph. (84f.) uses related imagery, and, as
Vian* notes, ἐκπεπότητο ill suits the abstract substantives. χρεμέδοντι
χρεμέδοντι δ' ἐΰκει : εἶδικα + dat. partic. are regular in the eophrasis,
cf. e.g. Σ 548; vi. 201, 211, 231; Kakridis 159; Traina, Maia 21, 1969, 71f.
χρεμέδοντι : statements of the kind found in JHS 95, 1975, 39.24: 'χρεμέδω
(AP 9.295.3) reappears only in Oppian' are all too prevalent in the field

of 'vocabulary studies'. The references to Oppian in LSJ may be supplemented by James, s.v. Add: (i) A.R.CA F 5.1 (ἰπποί). (ii) Gr.Naz.1375.307 (ἰππους). (iii) Nonn.38.420 (ἰπποί). (iv) ii.535 (ἰπποί); iii.681 (ἰππους).

151-3

A prayer to Athene in Triph.184~~8~~, but there from the Greeks as they are about to enter the Horse. Cf. on 122-56(A), fin.

151

δῖος ἑπειός : clausul. at Ψ 689, 838, 839, + infr. 329 and iv.329. μεγακλήτεος : whatever Q. thought μεγακλήτης meant of a dolphin (Φ 22), he uses the word here in the sense 'capacious', 'gigantic' (applied to a ship Θ 222al.). In Oppian of various sea-creatures (Hal. 1.254, 3.132, 546); Gr.Naz.628.637 μεγακλήτηα θήρα / = elephant. Cf. 314n.

152

Cf. i.182-4 (κλῶθι 186, βάωτον 188), xiii.545-6; O 371, 527 (κλῶθι 528) / εὔχετο χεῖρ' ὀρέγων , Ω 743 (ἐκ) χεῖρας ὀρέξας /. λαμδάτω : 77n. Commonly applied to deities in Q. (Zeus particularly, as Nonn.2.403), of Athene only here and Triph.44. Τριτωνίῃ : Q. 8x. See Bruchmann 15-16, adding Call.F 202.28.

152-157

For a comparable rapid and urgent appeal cf. Ov.Met. 10.673. The framework of this sequence is Homeric: Ψ 769-773 (Odysseus) / εὔχετ' Ἀθηνᾶν ἡ γλαυκῶπις ... / κλῶθι, θεῆ, ἀγαθῇ μοι ἐπὶ ῥοθός εἰθ' ἐπιδότιν' ὥς ἐφατ' εὐχόμενος, τῶ δ' ἐκλυσε Πάλλας Ἀθηναίᾳ γυνὴ δ' ... / ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ... (Games favour short speeches, cf. iv.408-9, Nonn.37.552, 620, 674, 756-7: but the claim of West, Hes.Th. p.94 [after Arend], repeated by Richardson on hDem. 248f., that short speeches are relatively rare in Il./Od. is simply not true).

153

μεγαθύμῃ : cf. 447infr. (where -θύμος presumably refers to the goddess' ire). An Odyssean epithet of Athene (θ 520 v 121), rare thereafter: see Bruchmann 10, adding Bacch.13.195. εἰδὼ δ' ἐμέ : at v 230 Odysseus appeals to Athene with the words εἰδὼ δ' ἐμέ , and Q. may have read there εἰδού ,

A Theomachy.

(A)

Cf. γ 1f., with a renewed dose at Φ 383f.; Sil. 9.267f. [before Cannae];
Nonn. 36.3f.

One might expect a formal Theomachy as a prelude to Troy's destruction, and Virgil's Sinon interestingly claims: praecipue cum iam hic.../staret equus toto sonuerunt aethere nimbi (A. 2.112-3³⁵), which looks like a vestige of the celestial din and discord that are associated with Theomachies (and Gigantomachies) and which can herald the summa dies³⁶. One may compare also Plato's account (R. 359d) of how Gyges' discovery of a hollow horse of bronze is preceded by a violent rainstorm and an earthquake.

Earth heaven and hell are thrown into a state of turmoil also in Triph., 559f.³⁷, where Homer is made use of in the portrayal of subterranean reaction, $\epsilon\phi\rho\iota\varsigma\epsilon\nu\ \delta\prime\ \text{Αΐδης}$... (570f.); but at a later stage, when Troy is under attack.

Q.'s Theomachy shares the fate of other Theomachies: it fizzles out without a clear result, as it must (so $\gamma - \Phi$, Sil., Nonn., and note, e.g., the divine conflict mentioned in Telegonia 318f.) and does not preclude subsequent intervention on the part of individual deities — the wrath of Zeus is directed against universal scrapping. In Il. and Sil. humans must be made aware of the fight as it entails divine espousal of individuals on the battlefield; in Nonn. the Theomachy accompanies fighting on earth but appears to constitute a detached tabloid; Q.'s Theomachy, heralding as it does the sack of a city, is appropriately divorced from the human sphere (184-5), particularly as the Trojans have no inkling of the imminent act of treachery — but it is a pity that the notion is brought into such intimate contact with the theme of mountain-tossing.

Keydell³⁸ suggests that 185-9 betray traces of a Gigantomachy. This is right, but the focus is too narrow. Q. (or his model) is in fact less indebted to Il.³⁹ than to the Hesiodic Titanomachy (Th. 617f.) and Typhonomachy (820f.), or more probably to elaborations of the imperial period,

when Gigantomachies were very much in vogue⁴⁰. The Theomachy of Sil. had already incorporated a number of Gigantomachy elements⁴¹; Nonnos, a poet who indulges in every conceivable extravagance, is surprisingly conventional — not the merest whiff of larger-than-life projectiles.

There follows a brief outline (not an exhaustive collection) of the two basic elements operative in Q.'s episode: T(heomachy), G(igantomachy and sim.):—

162-3:(T) Φ 385-6 / ἐν δ' ἀλλήλοισι θεῶν ἑρὶς πέεε δίκη δέ σφιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἦτο (cf. Υ 32a1.).

164-5, 174f.: sonic effects. (T) Φ 387-8 / εὖν δ' ἔπτεεν ..., βράχε δ' εὐρεῖα χθονί, / ἀμφὶ δὲ δάπνιζεν μέγας οὐρανός; Nonn. 36.90 ἐδμαράγησε ... Αἰθέρ/. (G) Hes. Th. 678f. περίαχε πόντος ἀπείρων, / γῆ δὲ μέγ' ἐδμαράγησεν, ἐπέετνε δ' οὐρανὸς εὐρύς; noise is the hallmark of Gigantomachies in Nonn. and elsewhere.

166:(T) Nonn. 36.83 ἀντίος ἔβτη/. (G) Hes. Th. 631 / ἀντίον ἀλλήλοισι, cf. id. 646; Claud. Gig. (2) 20 Ἡελίοιο καταντίον ἴβτατ'.

166-7:(T) cf. Υ 24a1.; Nonn. 36.5 / σέ μὲν ... σὺ δὲ ...

168:(T) similarly in Υ 13f. the statement 'and Poseidon came as well' is tacked on to the account of the general muster; cf. Sil. 9.299 multaque praeterea divorum turba minorum, and Poseidon's marine companions in Nonn. 36.93f. (G) Claud. Gig. 51, there come omnigenis coeuntia numina turmis (including deities of rivers and lakes, 43). See note ad loc.

172-3:(T) Φ 391-2 ἤρχε γὰρ Ἀρης / .. καὶ πρῶτος Ἀθηναίη ἐπόρουσε / ..., sim. Υ 69 (cf. 48 ~ 51) / ἄντα δ' ἔνυαλίοιο ... Ἀθῆναι / sc. ἴβτατ'; for this couple cf. Sil. 9.438f., Nonn. 36.9, 14, and (G) Aetna 61-2 (see Hildebrandt, Philologus, 66, 1907, 562f.), Claud. Gig. Lat. 75, 91f.

173:(G) Claud. Gig. (2) 60 Ζητὸς κατέναντα βεβήκει /.

174:(T) Nonn. 36.89 / εὐμπεων ἀλλήλοισι (but of spear and arrows).

174-5:(T) cf. Φ 408.

176-7, 180-3:(T) Υ 59-60; Sil. 9.300-1. (G) Hes. Th. 842-3 / πρὸς δ' ὅθι ἰθὺν ἀΐεσι, ἐπέετον ἄχιζε δὲ γαῖα, cf. Nonn. 2.34f., 394f., al.

178:(T)Sil.9.304. (G)Hes.Th.685f.(cf.also ἐνοπήν 708, εμεδάλεις 710)~
 Claud.Gig.73-4 horrendus../it fragor.

179-80:effects extend to underworld. (T)Υ61-2 εἴδεν δ' ὑπένερθεν
 εἰς ἐνέρων Ἀιδωνεύς, / δείας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο καὶ ἔαχε ...;Nonn.36.

97f.(βερέθρων 101). (G)Hes.Th.849-50 [cf.West on 682] .../ ῥίπῃ ὑπ'
 Ἀθανάων ..., / Τρέε δ' Ἀΐδης ἐνέροις καταφθιμένοις ἀνδρῶν / Τιτῆνές θ'
 Σποταρτάριοι .

181:(G)cf.Hes.Th.695 [sim.847] χθὺν ἀλῶα καὶ Ἰλκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα / ...

185-7:(T)Sil.9.466f., Pallas hurls at Mars partem vicini montis. (G)passim:
 e.g.Hes.Th.675,715; Claud.Gig.Lat.66f., Gr.(2)36f.; Nonn.45.175,202 κολῶναι

— Poseidon appears to have caught the habit in xiv.581.

185-6:(G)Claud.Gig.(2)73-4 Λυκαονίης ἀπὸ γαίης / πέτρῳ ἀπορρήξας..

ἐπέθηκε Γίγαντι /; cf. ἀπορρήξας in [Apollod.] 1.6.2.

187:(G)Hes.Th.684 ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι ἴεσαν βέλεα.

189:(G)Nonn.2.474 διερρηγύντο κολῶναι /.

189-90:(T)Φ388-9; Sil.9.470 (Athene hurls mountain-fragment) at non haec
 superum fallebant proelia regem.

191f.:(G)Nonn.2.421f.(see Vian ad loc.) πεφ'όρητο ... Ζεὺς, / ἐς'όκνος
 πετρώεντι χρόνου τετράσυχι δίφρω· / ἵπποι δὲ Κρονίωνος ὁμόσυχες ἦσαν
 Ἀῆται [the chariot is golden,701]. Zeus traditionally fights the Giants
 from a (four-horsed) chariot, cf.e.g.E.HF 177f.; A.B.Cook, Zeus (Cambridge 1925),
 2.1.830f.

[193:Iris is operative in Claudian's Gig.Lat.,42; cf.Vian, Guerre 54.]

196f.:(T)Υ56-7, esp.(G)Hes.Th.687f. [sim.839f.] οἱ δὲ κεραυνοί /.. ἄμα
 βροντῇ τε καὶ ὠκυποτῇ ποτεόντο.... / τάρφες, ἄμφι δὲ γαίῃ .. ἐμμάχισε /
 καιομένη φλὸς δ' ἥερα [αἰθέρα Naber] .. ἴκανεν / ὠκυποτος [~
 xiii.464-5]. Thunder-sequences are commonplace in (G), e.g. Aetna 63f.

202f.:Themis' intervention:(T)Sil.9.471f., Iris sent by Jupiter to stop
 fight with threats of punishment, cf.id.541f.,551f.; Nonn.36.107f. Hermes ~
 117χωόμενος Ζεὺς /.

206: ἰωχμοῖο :cf.Hes.Th.683.

206-8:(T) Φ 379-80 Hera(who $\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon$ 384) to Hephaestus: $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\acute{o} \dots, \sigma\acute{\upsilon} \gamma\alpha\rho$
 $\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$ / $\lambda\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\omega\delta\epsilon$ $\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ $\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\iota\acute{\varsigma}\epsilon\iota\nu$ ~ Φ 463-4 Apollo
 to Poseidon $\beta\omicron\iota\gamma\epsilon$ $\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ $\pi\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ / $\delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega\acute{\nu}$ κτλ.

209-10: a rocky grave is appropriate for Giants: Vian on Nonn. 2.468.

210: $\lambda\upsilon\alpha\rho\eta\acute{\iota}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$: cf. (T) γ 63, Nonn. 36.103; (G) Claud. Gig. (2) 61, Nonn. 2.267.

211: (T) Φ 321 $\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\eta\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}$ $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\iota\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\psi\theta\iota$ /, the river Scamander threat-
 ening Achilles.

213: $\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ ~ $\iota\sigma\acute{o}\phi\omicron\varsigma$ figure in Hes. Th.: 626, 652f., 658; 729f. (Zeus).

217f.: dispersal of combatants: (T) Φ 515f.

(B)

202-218, Themis' intervention.

Themis, ever anxious to avoid strife in heaven (cf. Pi. I. 8.31f., with
 H. Vos, Themis, Assen 1956, 58; A.R. 4.800f.) keeps a watchful eye on $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\acute{\nu}$
 $\epsilon\pi\iota\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\gamma\omega\nu$ (xiii.373; cf. further Kakridis 177). So in Nonn. 2.710f.
 it is Themis who displays the spoils of Typhoeus $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\delta\omicron\sigma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$.

We have already met a similarly structured episode in ix.313f. (cf.
 also i.403f. Theano ~ 475 $\tau\alpha\iota$ δ' $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ κτλ.): -Poseidon recommends that
 Apollo stop fighting: $\epsilon\kappa\phi\alpha\tau\omicron$ $\mu\upsilon\theta\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\iota\nu$ $\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\alpha\iota$ / $\iota\acute{\omicron}\chi\epsilon$...;
 Zeus will be displeased, and Poseidon himself will take ^{an} ~~positive~~ action,
 $\lambda\upsilon\alpha\rho\eta\acute{\iota}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$... $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\theta\rho\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\omicron$ $\iota\sigma\acute{o}\phi\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu$; Apollo obeys: he goes to
 heaven, Poseidon to the sea. Likewise viii.451f. (cf. Θ 139f.): Nestor warns
 off the Greeks with an assurance that Zeus will exact terrible vengeance
 (he quotes the case of the Titans) if they do not retreat. They comply,
 $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\lambda\eta\acute{\nu}$ (479).

The story-pattern is Homeric: (i) Θ 123f. Ἀθήνη $\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\iota$ $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$
 $\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ / $\omega\rho\tau\omicron$; she assures Ares that continued fighting will mean
 punishment from Zeus for all the gods. (ii) Zeus sends Iris with appropriate
 threats to stop (a) Θ 397f. Athene and Hera; the latter considers it point-
 less $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ $\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ $\pi\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ (428); (b) Θ 166f. Poseidon. (iii)
 ω 540f., Athene and Odysseus (/ $\iota\acute{\omicron}\chi\epsilon\omicron$ κτλ. ; δ' δ' $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron$).

Zeus of course often takes on the job of menacing recalcitrant deities

himself. One may compare here Claud. Rapt. 3.55f.: he will destroy son or daughter (~ Q. 210; cf. perhaps Poseidon's words in O 197) if need be: the offender will be consigned to the realm of Pluto. Themis' prediction reflects a typical savagery: e.g. Θ 13f. (one alternative: the offender will be tossed into Tartarus); A. Pr. 1016f. (burial in Hades under shattered rock; Prometheus will one day return εἰς φῶς).

157

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ .. μέν: once in Homer, ξ 301; Q., who has a highly antithetical style, is more fond of the phrase: ii. 490, iv. 74, v. 1, xi. 283. Δαναοί: 'Greeks' = Ἀργεῖοι + Ἀχαιοί + Δαναοί, Q. 444x. Δαναοί 102x, a higher proportion than in Homer (Il. 146:927; Od. 13:161); 'Danai' is the name used most often by Virgil for the Greeks, and least often by Homer' (Austin on A. 2.5). Q. however shows a marked preference for Ἀργεῖοι (224x; Il. 176x, Od. 30x, cf. Page 164.33). See Causer 281 and in general O'Nolan, CQ n.s. 19, 1969, 15-16. Δαναοὶ μὲν ἐγὴ' θέν: cf. xiv. 67 / ὥς Δαναοὶ περὶ πάντες ἐγὴ' θέν. Here and at ix. 39-40 (Ἀργεῖοι μὲν ... / Τρῶες δ' ...) we have a reflection of Ar.'s reading at H 214-5 τὸν δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι [cf. infr. 576] μὲν (μέγ' vulg.) ἐγὴ' θέν εὐαρόωντες, / Τρῶας δὲ ...; cf. iv. 17, where ἀλλ' ὅτε perhaps varies the reading μέγ', and ii. 630 μὲν Ἀργεῖοι μέγ' ἐγὴ' θέν; vii. 724=xiv. 629. [For μέγα γηθεῖν see Bissinger 246, adding Gr. Naz. 1371.251; EpGr. 421.3 Kaibel, Aegina, s.v.]. ἔργον ἔπεισιν = infr. 433, xiv. 88. This will certainly be a traditional phrase: Call. (F 197.3) labels a Hermes-statue πᾶρ' ἔργον ἵπποτέκτον[ος], and in Paus. 10.9.12 a bronze horse — τὸν δούρειον δηῖον — is ἔργον Ἀντιφάνους.

158

δερκόμενοι: cf. Ξ 140-1 / γηθεῖ ... / δερκόμενῳ, and J. Letacze, Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers, Heidelberg 1966, 134. πεφυσότες ἐνδοθι πύργων: an identical run in Nonn. 24.177; cf. Φ 528 / Τρῶες ... πεφυσότες, i. 640 Τρῶες ποτὶ ἄλτι πεφυσότες ~ Φ 532 προτὶ ἄλτι πεφ. At Σ 287 the Trojans are described as ἐλμένοι ἐνδοθι πύργων/. For the

67

clausula ἐνδοθι π, cf. also Triph. 391, Nonn. 25.7, 35.6 (Περιοχή 68). Στ'ς πύργου must have come from (ἔπει) οὐ 157. πεφυότες: full of alarm, as they had been routed: cf. xi. 316-7 ~ 299 and Gruber 30.

159

ἀλευόμενοι ... ἀνηλέα κῆρα: see 68n., and vii. 127 ~ μ 157, ο 275. θάνατον ... κῆρα: θάνατον and κῆρα(s) are often coupled in Homer (normally governed by a verb denoting 'escape'). Cf. e.g. Π 47a1. θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα ν-χ ~ χ. 37 θ. τε κ. καὶ κῆρας ν-χ (which draws on Φ 565; cf. iii. 266). ἀνηλέα κῆρα: cf. x. 101, 251; with πότμον vii. 127 + 3. α. has this epithet 17 times in all. The short form ἀνηλῆς occurs also in the following places: [f. l. Alcm. PMG 102]; A. R. 4. 1047; Man. 5. 187, 192, 263; GVI 1522. 3 (Cyrene, iip.). On its formation see A. C. Moorhouse, Studies in the Greek Negatives, Cardiff 1959, 50f.

160-1

See 189f. below. In ≡ 200f., 301f. Hera says she is going to Ocean and Tethys to sort out a marital problem; in Ovid (Met. 2. 510f., Fast. 5. 233) she goes to them to lodge a complaint; in Q. (v. 397f.) her visit is unmotivated. As Zeus is here apparently having a holiday, we might have expected explicit reference to the Ethiopians (A 423 Zeus goes 'to Ocean', Ψ 205 Iris goes 'to the streams of Ocean' to join the Ethiopians, Stat. Silv. 4. 2. 53f. Jupiter goes Oceani finem mensasque.../Aethiopum; α 22f. Poseidon visits them, ε 282f. spots Odysseus on his way back, sim. Sil. 12. 605f.): but cf. Stat. Ach. 1. 52f.: 'Neptune came Oceano...ab hospite, mensis/laetus'.

160

ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο ῥόας = Σ 240. This sequence recalls iii. 748f.: 'Achilles' horses wished ἐπὲρ Ὀκεανοῖο ῥόας καὶ Τηθύος ἄντρα/ἀνδρώπων ἀπάτερθεν .. φορέεσθαι /'. Τηθύος ἄντρα: a σπείος is mentioned in connexion with Eurynome daughter of Ocean in Σ 402; the domicile of another daughter, Styx, is called δῶματι in Hes. Th. 777, where a cave is very likely meant (see West ad loc.), and so Ocean and Tethys live δόμοισιν ≡ 202 ~ 303, cf. Stat. Theb. 8. 272-3. Ocean's ἄντρον is referred to explicitly in A. Fr. 133, 301, Claud.

Fesc.2.34-5, but I can parallel Q.'s language only with Stat.Ach.1.540-1 antris/Tethyos.

161

Ζηνὸς ὑπερθύμοιο :ii.434. ὑπερθύμος is common both in Homer and in Q., but there is only one point of contact, and that a slight one (iv.324 ~ B 746). θεῶν λιπότερθε :cf. perhaps Θ10: λιπότερθε (for λιπένθε) θεῶν Aristoph.

162

ἔμπεεν ὀδυνάτοισιν ἔρις :in addition to Φ385f. already quoted [on which see Gruber 51] cf. Φ513, and for ἔμπεεν Anon.APlan.374.5, Nonn.19.228; ii.507. δίχα... θυμός :see on 157-218, and [Hes.] F 204.95-6 πάντες δὲ θεὸν δίχα θυμὸν ἔθεντο / ἐξ ἔριδος ; Σ510 γ150 δίχα δὲ ἔφικεν—ου—x ; ἔφικε θυμός is a clausula at Σ155 (with an identical type of enallage [which cod.R eliminates], on which see Chantraine 2.322f., Kühner-Gerth 2.2.111) and κ415. Cf. in general i.439 ὀρίνετο δὲ ἔφικε θυμός /.

163

ζνέμων... ἀέλλαις = [Orph.] A.685, cf. N 334, 795, hHom.33.14 etc., and ctr. vii.139. The picture is reminiscent of Athene's ride in A.R.2.538, νεφέλῃς ἐπὶ βῶα...

164

ὀρυνόθεν φορέοντο :Nonn.24.74 /ὀρ. πεφόρητο. ποτὶ χθονά :a late expression, 5x Q., and [Opp.] Cyn.3.124, 383, 4.199; Eudoc.Cypr.2.37; γένος Πινδάρου (hexam.) ap. Cougny, AppAnth.74.6p.300 (see Ludwig, RhM 34, 1879, 357f.). ἐπὶ (codd.) could just be right: Homer has ποτὶ χθονί Φ426 (κείντο π.), θ378, cf. hAp.459: ἐπὶ is a variant in the first (strongly supported) and the third (cod.M), and cf. Δ78 (Athene) κ' ἵεν ἐπὶ χθονά sc. κατ' Οὐλύμποιο. But it seems better to envisage ἐπὶ as arising from ἐπὶ 165 (Vien*).

164-5

αἰθῆρ / ἔβραχεν :cf. A.R.4.642 ἐπὶ μέγας ἔβραχεν αἰθῆρ / (in reply to Hera's scream). Other echoes: [Orph.] A.995; ix.296 (Apollo descending from Olympus, borne by clouds); xiv.464 (Athene); cf. also ii.495 corr. (ὀρυνός).

165

οὐ ... ἐπὶ : Z²⁸⁶ γὰρ δὲ μολοῦντα πατὶ... ἐπὶ Ξάνθοιο βρέθρα: similar

patterns in v.433,viii.143,ix.178;ctr.xi.21;iii.23-4,iv.156-7,viii.34'-5.

The only instance outside Q. seems to be Colluth.70 Ξάνθοιο παρ'..βρέθροισι /.

Earlier Ξάνθοιο βράχων / (Z⁴ Θ⁵⁶⁰), A.R.1.309 ἐπὶ Ξάνθοιο βροῦν / (sim.

Alcm.FMG 1.100); but the basic shape is Homeric: cf. Φ²⁵; Ψ²⁰⁵ etc.

166

ἀλλήλων ἴσαντο καταντίον: cf. E⁵⁶⁹; viii.267; 67n. This is Gigantomachy

language, see on 157-218.

166-7

After Θ⁷³⁻⁴ / αἰ μὲν Ἀχαιῶν Τρώων δὲ...; cf. also Η²⁷⁵. For a preposition with the second member only see Kühner-Gerth 2.1.550: I have not investigated the distribution of this phenomenon in later epic.

167

πολέμου δ' ἔρος : cf. i.404 πολέμοιο δ' ἔρωι ἄλβεν Ἰπποδάμειαν /, and earlier N⁶³⁸⁻⁹; 164. There are variations on this sequence at i.436-7, vii.434, and note iii.408 γού δ' ἔρος [Λ²²⁷] ἐμπέτε θυμῷ /.

ἔρος ἐμπέτε : elsewhere in verse only in tragedy, A.Ag.341, E.IA 808.

ἐμπέτε θυμῷ : cf. above, and iv.499; Homeric.

168

See introd.n. to 157-218. Marine deities are deployed by Rheia and figure prominently in the extravaganza of Nonn.D.43 (which is really a Gigantomachy in disguise, cf. 222f., 302f.), as well as in Jupiter's general ~~unions~~ assemblies in Claud.Rapt.3.1f., Sid.Carm.7.20f. καὶ οἱ ἰάχον: cf. A.R.1.920 καὶ

οἱ ἰάχον ὄργιζε κείνα /; Nonn. is fond of this run: D.1.228 καὶ οἱ ἰάχον ἄντυγας Εὐρού/, +5. ἰάχον.. πόντον: so Nonn.43.123 ἰάχε.. πόντον (sim.10.134); Hom. ἔλαχον.. ἄλλα (O¹⁹⁰). εὐρέα πόντον: cf. infr. 336 νηῆες ἐπέπλεον εὐρέα πόντον / ~ Hes.Op.650 νηὶ ἐπέπλεον ε.π./, Z²⁹¹.

The same clausula in ω¹¹⁸; vi.113. Form εὐρέα: Kost on Musae¹ 229. „

169

καί ῥ' οἱ μὲν : Q. 10x in all, cf. K⁵⁴¹; A.R.3.448; [Orph.] A.520, 1369;

Gr.Nez.440.22 and often. So infr.498 and iv.278, xiv.316 καί ῥ' οἱ μὲν

=GVI 1726.7 (Pisidia, 'vor 212 n. Chr. '); Opp. Hal. 4.84; Rufin. AP 5.35.3 oodd.; [Orph.] A.1286. αι (xiv.386,542): Σ 597; [Orph.] A.435. ο (vi.240, ix.24, xi.44) is commonest of all: 1634al.; Panyas. F5 Kinkel; A.R. 2.921al.; Opp. Hal. 2.412al., [Opp.] Cyn. 4.93, 172; [Orph.] L.73; Gr. Naz. 554.424, 628. 635; Agath. AP 9.677.5 [Viansino 50]; Paul. Sil. AP 5.255.7 [Viansino 58], 300.5 [50], Amb. 252; Anon. AP 11.125.3.

169-70

δολόμεντα ... / ἵππον : cf. xiv.139.

170

ἵππον ἀμαλγῶναι = 445; M₁₈ / τεῖχος ἀμ.

170-1

ἐρατεινὴν / Ἰλίου : an isolated Homericism, E₂₁₀ Ἴλιον εἰς -ήν /, where, as here, we are not dealing with a purely decorative epithet.

171

It is perhaps idle even to ask how the statement that Destiny prevented an all-out assault on either Horse or Troy can be reconciled with the positive effort on the part of the combatants to engage in noiseless noise (185). Αἶδω ... πολύτροπος : infr. 390 'shifty', here 'changeable', 'unpredictable', cf. Bion F8.5 Μοῖρα πολύτροπος, and Nonn. 41.317. At v. 238 νῆος Λαέρταο πολύτροπα μῆδεα νωμῶν (note δολομήτα 292, κερδᾶλέων 306, and see Pfeiffer on Call. F67.3) Q. echoes [Hes.] F198.3 νῆος Ἀ. πολύκροτα μῆδεα εἶδώς : like most others in antiquity (Lehrs 414f.) he does not seem to have considered the possibility that in α1-2 ὅς μῆλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη was designed as a gloss on πολύτροπον (which could in fact be intentionally ambivalent: the epithet seems strategically placed at κ330). ἐς δὲ κυδοιμόν : cf. A₅₂, 538 ἐν δὲ κυδοιμόν /, v. 25, vi. 350 ἐν φεῖ -σι' (-ός) /; there are related clausulae in A.R. 1.1028; Or. Sib. 2.22, 11.177; Nonn. D. 22x. κυδοιμός is properly tumultuous fighting (Trumphy 158-9), but there is no telling how Q. envisaged its sense ('war' simply? Cf. Ebeling s.v.).

172

τρέψε νόον μακάρεσσιν : τ⁴⁷⁹ / τηῖ .. Ἀθηναίῃ νόον ἔτραπεν . Ἄρης

... μόθοιο resembles Σ 51 $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta' \epsilon\acute{\zeta}\eta\rho\chi\epsilon \gamma\acute{o}\theta\iota\omicron$ /. For the language see 157-218n., and Nonn. 39.385 $\iota\acute{\upsilon}\delta\mu\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota\varsigma \eta\rho\chi\epsilon$. Q. may have in mind hereabouts E 592 ($\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu$ 593) = Σ 516 ($\chi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ 517, $\epsilon\omega\tilde{\nu} \tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ 518). In view of the Gigantomachy atmosphere ('Pampr.' GDK 35.4.13 $\text{Ζῆν} \alpha \gamma\iota\gamma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\omicron \kappa\upsilon\beta\epsilon\rho\nu\eta\tau\eta\rho\alpha \chi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$ [ε, cf. Nonn. D. passim]) it is possible that $\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\eta\rho\chi\epsilon$ is a vestige of the common concept of Ares the dancer (see Borthwick, Hermes 96, 1968, 64; Fitton, CQ n.s. 23, 1973, 257): cf. Lyc. 249-50 $\text{Ἄρης} \dots \epsilon\acute{\zeta}\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$. Vian* prefers to take the verb at face value. μόθοιο : 22n.

173

κατεναντίον : Homeric hapax (Φ 567; also Scut. 73), cf. i. 511; twice in Alexandrine verse (Theoc. 1.22, A.R. 2.360), but widespread thereafter: Or. Sib. F1.12; Man. 3.137 +5; Dion. Bass. F20v12; D. P. 1089; [Orph.] L. 180 +2; Gr. Naz. 995.336, 1365.167; [Apolin.] 9.38 +8; Pall. AP 11.288.1 and Anon. 9.132.1. The plural -αντία is rather less popular (Kost's note on Musae. 254 misses Man. 4.462; [Apolin.] 96.10, 113.13v.1., 118.315). ὤς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι : a favourite run of A.R. (ἄλλοι or ᾗ ἄλλοι) either at the end of the verse (1.910, 1101, 3.992; cf. iii.321, infr. 562) or its beginning (2.874, 3.365; cf. xiv.590). Elsewhere only in Oppian, Hal. 1.733 $\text{ἄ} - \text{ὤς} \dots$

174

εὐμπεσον ἄλλήλοισι : an identical expression in the Theomachy of Nonn. 36.89 (see above); [Orph.] A. 699— $\eta\epsilon\iota$,

174-5

περὶ φίλοι ἔχεν : similarly viii.174-5 περὶ φίλοι δ' [cf. xi.215 $\alpha\iota\acute{o}\lambda\alpha \tau\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta / \epsilon\acute{\beta}\rho\alpha\chi\epsilon\nu$, ii.466-7 περὶ δὲ φίλοι ἀμβροτα τεύχη / ... $\text{ἔρᾳβη}\epsilon\epsilon$; v.2 ἄμβροτα τεύχη /]. Homer has $\text{ἄμβροτα τεύχη} - \chi$ (P 194, 202 = v.319; cf. v.126, and xii.303; vii.200). δ' in third position is common in epic when preceded by preposition-noun; ctr. viii.47 (adaptation of various Iliadic iuncturae). ἄμβροτα τεύχη / χρύβεια : cf. L 340-1al. $\text{πέδιλα} / \text{ἄμβροτα χρύβεια}$, and Z 235-6, hHom. 28.5-6 $\text{τεύχε}^{\prime} \dots / \text{χρύβεια}$. Contracted -η (of which Aristarchus disapproved, La Roche, HU 1.147) is widespread in Homeric papyri (West, PP 105). The pattern epithet— $\text{τεύχη} /$ is presented by most manuscripts at X 322, $\text{τεύχη} /$ at H 207; cf. also hHom. 28.15 θεοείκελα

τεύχη /, and Shipp(cit. 71 above), 183 for a survey of -η in the Hymns.

Q. builds a number of units on these models: ἄγλαὰ τεύχη/(2x), αἰὼλά (3x; cf. E 295), ἄμβροτα (see above), ἄπετα (2x), σήϊα (1x), κατὰ γαῖαν (1x), κλυτὰ (1x; cf. E 435al.), κούριμα (1x), παγχάλεκα (1x; cf. X 322).
κινυμένοισι : cf. i. 546-7, ix. 78-9; A 46-7. μέγ' ἔαχεν = Δ 125, cf. ix. 297 (ν infr. 530), al.; and B 333-4 μέγ' ἔαχον, ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆες ἰομερταλέον (ν infr. 178).. ἄνδ' ἄντων (ν 177).

175-80

mirror the battle-scene of ii. 495-7.

175-6

ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος ... : cf. ii. 495 (supr.); Anyt. HE 724-5 ἀμφὶ δὲ πόντος /
 δειμαίνει, [Opp.] Cyn. 2. 436-7 (π. ἀφριόα); A. R. 3. 166 ¹ου ἀμφὶ ...
πόντος /... ²πεμαράγησεν : after B 210 βμαραγεῖ δέ τε πόντος; [Opp.]
 Cyn. 1. 383 πόντος ... περιβμαραγεῖ. For ἐπ- (ἐπ- Spitzner) cf. 181
 (and the note); ii. 545-6 (corr.) βράχεν δέ οἱ ἄπετα τεύχη / γαῖα δ'
 ὑπεμαράγησε, and ctr. infr. 456 ν ix. 131-2 (one may recall here the use
 of ἐπέβραχε). ὑποβμαραγεῖν seems confined to Q.; ἐπιβμ- occurs in the
 Oppians (James s.v.) and in Nonn. D. (Peek s.v.); Met. 12. 116.

176-7

κελαινὴ ποσσὶ : strongly reminiscent of Hes. Th. 69f. ('black earth';
 'feet'); N 18-19 (elaborated by Nonn., 42. 445-6) τρέμε δ' οὐρεα μακρὰ καὶ
 ὕλη / ποσσὶν δ' ἔλθ' ἄνατολιν Περσεφώνος ἰόντος [after 18 [Long.] 9. 8
 cites καὶ κορυφαὶ Τρώων τε πόλεις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν = Υ 60, cf. on 183 below,
 and A. Ludwig, Die Homervulgata als voralexandrinisch erwiesen, Leipzig
 1898, 148]. Q. employs similar language at viii. 344, ix. 310-11, x. 61-2.

176

κελαινὴ ... γαῖα : here only? Ctr. Π 384 (χθών); Scut. 153 (λίη s.v. 1.).
δ' ἔτρεμε γαῖα : so, but with γαῖα, K 390.

177

μακρὸν ... ἄνδ' ἄντων : a common turn of phrase in Homer, as in the formula
μακρὸν ἄνδ' ἄντων, Z 66 etc.; cf. viii. 326; xi. 490 (ν E 101al.).

178

Q. is less successful than many Roman poets in injecting new life into this Homeric cliché (examples in West on Hes. Th. 684-5): ii. 467f., iii. 507, v. 492, vi. 328f., xiv. 89. εμερδαλέη δ' ἐνοπή: for the form cf. hAp. 360 / θεεπεσίη δ' ἐνοπή! ...; for the content, A.R. 2. 1206 / εμερδαλέην ἐνοπήν. μέχρις: sc. ἐς, cf. 536n. and ii. 470; Φ 522. οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανε: θ 74, and again at [Orph.] A. 687 (δινύπος).

179

The whole line already in vi. 490. In both places codd. offer βερέθρων for the expected accusative which Vian prints, wrongly I think (cf. his Rech., 200). Q. is influenced by the genitive in such expressions as Call. F75.15 Ἀ[ιδ]εω μέχρις .. δόμων /; Antiphil. GPh 958 = Bianor id. 1666 ἄχρι καὶ Ἀΐδεω /; cf. also Leon. HE 2415 ἄχρις ἐπ' ἡνὸς / (upon which doubt is cast by Gow, CQ n.s. 8, 1958, 119.1). The genitive here is easier than is ἄχρις ἐπ' with dative (see Vian Rech. loc. cit.; Or. Sib. 1.2, guaranteed by the metre, ctr. id. 12.104). — Vian* concurs. Ἀιδωνῆος: also iii. 15 (the text should be left alone). Meineke convincingly restored this form to Euph., CA 98.4; it recurs in Gr. Naz. (514.8) and in Nonn. (30.172). [A doubtful conjecture in SEG 18.266.10; = IG 10.447, where see Edson]. On -ογενής -ωνενής in general: J.-L. Perpillou, Les substantifs grecs en -εής, Paris 1973, 382f. Ἀιδωνῆος .. βερέθρων: ctr. A.R. 2. 642 Ἀΐδαο -ων / . -στο βερέθρων: for this clausula cf. (μ 94 δαινοῖο βερέθρου / ν xiii. 550 (κοίλοιο) [Orph.] A. 967, Gr. Naz. 1500.277, Nonn. Met. 2. 104 = D. 30.159.

180

See introd. n. to 157-218, and Triph. 570 (ἐφρίξεν .. Ἀΐδης). The motif is used jokingly in Luc. Trag. 197 (τρομέει ... Ἀΐδας), Pall. AP 11.281 (τρομέων Ἀιδωνενής); it was popular with Roman epic poets: Virg. A. 8.243f. (barathrum; trepident); Ov. Met. 2.260f. (terret), 5.356f. (pavet; trepidantes terreat), cf. 6.699; Stat. Theb. 7.817, 8.31f.; Sil. 5.617f., 12.129. Cf. in general J. Kroll, Gott und Hölle, Leipzig 1932, 367f. Τιτῆνες δ' ἐπένεπθε: cf. Ξ 274 ὧς ἐνέπθε θεοί, [Orph.] H. 37.1-2 / Τιτῆνες γαίης ἐπένεπθεν /.

μέγ' ἔτρεβαν : viii.218 [f.l.xiii.428] : the phrase seems peculiar to Q., who has μέγα also with ὑποτρομεῖν and τρομεῖν (so already Opp.Hal.1.522; περιτρ — id.4.194), cf. Bissinger 248. τρεῖν here is certainly not to be rendered zurückschrecken (Lehrs 81), as the parallels show: cf. Doederlein 2.156; Vian on ii.522 (p.167). ἀμφὶ δὲ μακρῇ : so A.R.4.129 (—α'), = ii.351 [ctr.West 258], viii.181, ix.294, x.417, to which should be added, pace Vian, vii.258 (v.l.).

180-3

See on 176-7. Similar language is used to describe the coming of the god Ares at i.686f. There as here we have in relatively simple form the widespread epic motif of specific localities responding to the tread or noise of a deity: e.g. Call.Del.136f.; Virg.A.3.672f., 7.511f.; Stat.Theb.3.420f., 7.64f.; Sil.4.443f.; Claud.Ruf.1.131f., Eutr.2.160f.

180-1

μακρῇ / Ἰδῇ : Q. only, xiv.82 μακρῇ δ' ἀμφέβτενεν Ἰδῇ/, ii.561, iii.303-4 (μακεδνῆς); but cf. Ov.Ep.16.110 longa... Ida.

181

Ἰδῇ .. πᾶσα : but N₁₃ πᾶσα .. Ἰδῇ/. ὑπέβτενε : cf. Sulp.Max.GVI 1924. 17 / γαῖα δ' ὑπέβτενε πᾶσα, and viii.88 (corr.Vian), 244. καὶ ἠχήμεντα ῥέεθρα : a combination exclusive to Q. (so with ῥέον vi.379, vii.548): viii.344-5 (descent of Athene) ἔτρεμε δὲ χθονὶ δῖα καὶ ἠχήμεντα ῥέεθρα / ≡ ἄνδου... δέος δ' (≈ infr.184).

181-2

ῥέεθρα / .. ποταμῶν : elsewhere the other way round: P₇₄₉ ποταμῶν υυ — υ ῥέεθρα /; iii.639 ποταμῶν τε ῥέεθρα / = A.R.1.27; [Orph.] A.1009; Hymn.Mag. GDK 59.1.8 (conj.).

182

ἀενάων ποταμῶν = viii.468, heading a pentam. in SEG 18.137(b)2 (Corinth, iiii), 1 υυ ἀ... in Hes.Op.737, Call.Cer.14, D.P.1055, with word(s) intervening E.Ion 1083, Alph.GPh 3544. Other examples: (i) Sing., Q. only, iv.10; ii.624, vii.587; (x.174). (ii) Dat. plur.: Simon.FMG 581.2, D.P.1124; — ἀ' σ' 61 .. ποταμοῖσι (ν) [Apolin.] 77.39 = AF 14.25.3. (iii) Rarely with noun first:

A. Suppl. 553, Or. Sib. 4.165. δ' ἄμα ποῖβι : cf. v. 19, and for epithet...
noun ix.141. The pattern is Apollonian (1.637, 3.256, cf. A 348).

183

For the line as a whole cf. N14 Πριάμοιο πόλιν καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν /; V 60 (Theomachy), cited on 176-7. νῆες τ' Ἀργείων : 'the ships of the Argives' is an Homeric cliché: e.g. L 298 / νῆας ἐπ' Ἀργείων = xiv.57; κ 15 / Ἴλιον Ἀργείων τε ^{νῆας} ~~νῆας~~. κύδιμον ἔβου : κύδιμος makes a brief appearance in early epic (hHerm. 9x, in the formula κύδιμος Ἑρμῆς / (-ον -ῆν, cf. [Hes.] Th. 938), hHerm. 84 -ος Ἀργειφόντης /; Cyp. F 11.4 -ος ἡρώς /, revived in GVI 1843.7 (=IME 68, i-ii); once in Pindar, O. 14.24 κυδίμων ἑβόλων (GES 78. 10, Magnesia, iip, ἑβόλον κύδιμον), but apparently not again until the post-Alexandrine era, when it was popular, particularly from iip on. (I count over 40 examples outside Q.). Its popularity may be accounted for by the fact that -ίμος is exceptionally common in the koine, and imperial verse was productive in new formations (cf. Chantraine, Form. 152-3). — Q. has the following examples; all save the first are in noun-epithet combinations:—
(i) xiv.201. (ii) iv.451, xii.183 -ον ἔβου /. (iii) v.442 -α τεύχη /. (iv) infr.243 +3 -ος ἄνθρωπος / = Leo Phil. AP 9.201.2, cf. Doroth. Cat. Cod. Astr. 6.98. 104; xi.358 -σι ἄνδρες /. (v) υ' (ός) : -infr.297 Ἀχιλῆος .. -ος υ'ός / ~ vii.576 ὡς ἄρα -ος υ'ός εὐπτολέμων Ἀχιλῆος ~ Synes. H. 5.28 -ος υ'ός; accus., following a strict pattern: vi.143 / τῶ δ' ἄρα -ον υ'ᾶ, vii.325 ὡς ἄρα -ον υ'ᾶ μενεπτολέμων Ἀχιλῆος ~ Synes. H. 4.3 θεοῦ -ον υ'ᾶ; vii. 121 ὡς ἄρα -σι υ'ῆς εὐπτολέμων Ἀργείων. (vi) xiii.506 -α τέκνα φιλοπτολέμων Ἀργείων / ~ GVI 439.4 (Thrace, ii-iii) / -α τέκνα.

184

ἄλλ' ... δέος : reminiscent of ii.272, vii.310, ix.205-6. ἄνθρωποι πέλει : in the same sedes 1592 ἄνθρωποι πέλει (= Man. 4.619, [Opp.] Cyn. 1.455); in reverse δ 565 [περ ... cf. xii.233 corr.] πέλει ἄνθρωποιεν / = v.234, with word intervening vii.79, 87, 310 (supr.), ix.194, cf. infr.233 corr. δέος οὐδ' : cf. ε 347. οὐδ' ἐνόησαν : Hom. οὐδ' ἐνόησάν -εν /.

185

ἐννεσίησι : 4n.

185-6

Conceivably a faint echo of 481, but we are more likely dealing with the stock language of Gigantomachies: cf. Claud. cited above on 157-218; Nonn. 17.

139-41 σ' μὲν ἐν αὐλῶν / ῥήξ' ἄμενοι κρηπῖδας ἐκαύφικαν, σ' δὲ κολῶνῆς / ..
πρηῶνα. For κολῶνῆς ... cf. xiv. 484 with Vian's note.

186

ἔπορρηξαντες ἄπ': cf. i. 696-7; Claud. cited above. Y's ἔπορρ— is probably a mere error rather than a conscious attempt to dispose of ἄπο-ἄπ'.

ἄπ' οὐρεος Ἰδαίου = iii. 674. ἄπ' οὐρεος in hexameters first in the Alexandrine period (Call. F 186.9, A. R. 1.989, 2.1258; cf. Theoc. 1.77, 4.35), but common thereafter: followed by a proper adj. elsewhere only D. P. 694 + 3 (Ἀρμενίου).

— οὐρεος codd.: ρ/δ are easily enough confused in minuscule: but perhaps
ιδ-αίου lent a helping hand.

187

βῆλλον ἐπ' ἀλλήλων: after Σ 534 155 / βῆλλον δ' ἀλλήλων; for ἐπ'
ἀλλήλων cf. 129; x. 47 (codd., see Erbse 565, Scarcella 517). αἰ δὲ ..

ὁμοίαι: cf. E 778 / αἰ δὲ ... ὁμοίαι /, K 437 ... δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοίαι /.

'Like sand' is normally applied to vast numbers (e.g. B 800; Call. Dian. 253),

but note the simile of O 361f. The detail is no doubt traditional in

Gigantomachies, cf. the 'ashes' (in a different connexion) in Claud. Gig. Gr.

(2) 19, and see Vian on Nonn. 2.116.

188

ῥέτω διεκκίδναντο: cf. Nic. Alex. 333 (~ [Apolin.] 58.23). περί: περί
δ' (codd.) looks like an attempt—and a ludicrous one—to plug up the
hiatus.

189

ῥηγνύμεναι διὰ τυτθῶν: i.e. (see Gow on Theoc. 3.21) τυτθὰ διαρρ— (Nonn.
2.474 Gigantomachy, διερρήγυντο κολῶναι /), cf. xiv. 534-5 (Athene) / ἐμβαλε
νῆι κεραυνόν, ἄφαρ δέ μιν ... / ἐβέβηκεν διὰ τυτθῶν and id. 76 / τυτθὰ
διατμήσῃ (from μ 17' cf. Opp. Hal. 1.318). ῥηγνύμεναι (codd.) is a slip, or
so one can hope: 'broken-through limbs, just a little' would not be beyond

the fantasies of some copyists.

189-90

Διὸς νόημα : cf. Λ 331 τὴν δ' αὖ λάθον.. Ζῆν /, Π 232, [Orph.] A.1035;

O 461 / αὖτ' αὖτ' ἡθε Διὸς πυκινὸν νόον. ἐπὶ πείραδι γαλήης : cf. ι 284,

Man.6.445; παρ' Ἰλκεανοῦ ῥοῆς ἐπὶ π. γ. / hAphr.227; and (Vian*) A.R.3.679al.

For this association see Ξ 200f., =301f.; Hes.Op.168f.; Cypr.F 7.10. ἡ

νόημα : 98n.; P 409 Διὸς .. νόημα /.

190-1

Ζιπὼν ... : cf. viii.95 Ζιπὼν δ' ἄφαρ ; μ 1 Ζιπὼν ῥόον Ἰλκεανοῦ /, Hes.Op.

566, Anon.Boeot.PMG 690.8; Mimn.IEG 12.3-4 ἥως / Ἰλκεανὸν προλιποῦς ὀρᾶν

εἶδαν βῆ ~ vi.1-2; EpGr.782.2 Kaibel (Halicarnassus, iii-ii) χῆμα Ζιπὼν.

Ἰλκεανὸν / χέματ' : only in Q.(v.14, vii.303, viii.463) and in Nonn.(5.487).

εἰς ὀρᾶν εὐρὺν ἀνέλκε : again xiv.228 and, with the preposition dropped,

ii.189, v.396.

191-5

Morbus senioris aetatis. Homer has a number of descriptions of chariots and the attendant preparations for a journey (cf. Arend 86f., with T.Krischer, Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik, Munich 1971, 142f.). We seem to

be offered here an 'updated' version of the elaborate chariot of E 720f.

(cf. Θ 382f.) associated with Hera (E 731 ὅπερ δὲ Σουὸν ἡγάγετ' Ἥρη /) and

Hebe (cf. ἀφιδίτος in E 724). In the imperial epoch Aeon (see Vian, *Budé* i,

xvi-xvii) is closely linked with the winds (Levi, Hesperia 13, 1944, 296 et

circa), as Iris the rainbow is with them (West on Hes. Th.266). For a compar-

able chariot in Nonnos see on 157-218, and for the winds as horses/horsemen

Nonn.41.173 ~ A 177 179; Lloyd-Jones, CQ n.s.7, 1957, 24 (bibliogr.).

192

Identical in structure to viii.242. — For the grouping E-B cf. Nonn.39.

112 (followed by N-Z), for Z-N (preceded by B-E) Ov. Ars 2.432. It is unusual

to find four winds named in the space of a single line or less: cf. here

Sil.9.493 E-B-Caurus-N; others: EZBN: Sen. Ag.476, Jo. Gaz.1.229; NBZE: Nonn.38.

348 cf. id.12.61 N-B-Lips-E. Homer breaks into a further line (ϵ 295-6

ENZB cf. Arat.933-4; sim. ϵ 331-2 NBEZ ~ Nonn.47.360-1 cf. id.25.216-7), and a

couplet or more (normally in the context of an ἀνέμῳ ἑταίῳ) is general in both Greek and Roman verse.

193

τοὺς : H's τοὺς δ' could be regarded as *lectio difficilior*, but Y is in general more reliable and τοὺς is preferable here (Vian*). ὑπὸ ... : cf. E 731 cited above, al.; and T 404 / τὸν δ' ... ὑπὸ συρόφῃ ... αἰὸ' λος ... θεεπέβιον : because it belongs to a deity, cf. e.g. A 591, viii.350; Bechtel 164, Fraenkel on A. Ag. 1154. Similarly Nonn. 11.119-20 Λυαίου / θεέκελον ἄρμα . αἰὸ' λος : Iris was traditionally 'fleet' (ταχεῖα etc.) and αἰὸ' λος was commonly so explained in antiquity; an alternative rendering however was ποικίλος (Erbse on schol. M 167c¹; Pfeiffer on Call. F 575), and this is presumably what Q. means here. [In an epigram ap. Peek, SHAW 1971.2, p. 12 Hermes the messenger is labelled πανταίολος, and that must mean ταχύς]. If so, he appears to be the only Greek poet to bestow upon Iris *qua* goddess a decorative epithet referring to the various hues of the rainbow (ctr. Nonn. 32.79). Statius calls her *virgo/discolor* (Theb. 10.118-9) and Roman poets in general are fond of referring to her wealth of colours (Virg. A. 4.700-1, see Pease's notes; Ov. Met. 1.270-1 etc.).

194

ὅ' οὐ κα' μέν ... : H 220 (γάκος) δ' οὐ Τυχίος κα' με τεύχων/. ἄμβροτος Αἰών : see Vian, Budé i, p. xviii; and Anon. AP 9.788.1-2.

195

χερδὶν ὑπ' ἀκαμάτοισιν : this phrase occurs in the following places:— (i) ii.296 (ii) vii.99 (iii) ix.397 (iv) xii.195 (v) xiv.446 (vi) xiv.481. The archetype had -τοῖσιν in (ii)(iv)(v) and almost certainly in (i)(vi) also; but in (iii) -τηῖσιν. It seems reasonable to follow Vian in adopting -τοῖσιν in all six places, though Q. may conceivably have varied the terminations (as he seems to have done in iv.485, v.526, xi.407, xiv.632; all corrected by Vian), given that vacillations of this type were rampant in the texts of antiquity: for a similar problem cf. cod. hDem. 232 [see Richardson there, and id. p. 114, adding Scut. 339] ~ 253. -ος : cf. [Apolin.] 73.33 -ος χερσιν/. -η : cf. Hes. Th. 519, 747; (demanded by the metre:) i.678, iv.449.

Nonn.(28.214) has /-ων ... χειρῶν/. ἄτειρέος: applied to χαλκός in Homer, and so Emp.F 143; [Opp.] Cyn.3.320. ἐξ ἀδάμαντος: cf.x.60 (weapons of Eris), Nonn.29.197 (chariot), and for the other-worldliness of this material H.Troxler, Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods, Zürich 1964, 19f. The same clausula in Theoc.17.21 (εἰπεῖτο τετυγμένα ἐξ), Pancrat.GDK 15.2col.2.5.

196-201

See on 93-100.

196

ἦκετο δ' ...: cf. O84. Οὐλύμποιο ρῖον μέγα: Homer has -οιο .. ρῖον (≡ 154) and ρῖον -οιο / (Θ^{25a}l. cf. Nonn.33.64 ρῖον .. -ον /). A closer parallel is afforded by Or.Sib.14.218 μέγαν περὶ ρῖον -ον /, where Meineke, forgetting that he was dealing with a subliterate, deleted μέγαν and read περὶ ρῖον -οιο /. [μέγα τε ρῖον f.v.l.schol.A.R.1.1165].

196-7

See 95-6.

197

ἦερα: αἰθέρα codd. In 94supr. Zeus is in the αἰθήρ that surrounds the peak of Olympus⁴²; in 96 he produces shock-waves in the underlying atmosphere (cf. ὑπερθε, from above: see schol. B 458, with Erbse; Koechly on iii. 708), and at 199 in the present sequence the atmosphere (αἴθρ) is ablaze; cf. Vian on vii.532. The gods have descended to earth and the αἰθήρ is of no concern to them: αἰθέρα, pace Vian, cannot seriously be considered. The two words are of course often confused: West on Hes.Th.697. χολούμενος: cf.ii.640, from [Hes.] F 30.15. ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλαι: ix.176 (-ον/). ἄλλοτε perhaps only in Q.: [Theoc.] 9.6 is a hopeless line, and ἄλλοτε is far from certain in Musae.84. For -θε forms see C.A.Lobeck, Patholog.Gr.Serm. elem.2.145f.; M.Lejeune, Les adverbs grecs en-θεν, Bordeaux 1939, 106f.

198

βρονταὶ ... ἐκτυπον: cf.56-7.

198-9

ἐκ δὲ κεραυνοί // .. ἐξεχέοντο: ἐκ (Rhodemann for Λ's ἐν δὲ) is

confirmed by v.106-7; hardly οἱ δὲ κ. (West, QQ n.s.13, 1963, 62). The anticipation of the preverb is common in Q. (iii.739-40, xiii.495-6, xiv.563-4 etc.) as elsewhere (e.g. H 438, [Orph.] L.301; the composer of PHib.19 Γ^{302a} [West, PP 53] was, if εἰπὶ is right, aiming at such an effect: εἰπὶ δὲ στειροπῆν ἐφείκεν).

199

ταρφέες : cf. i.691-2 ~ Hes. Th.690f. ποτὶ χθόνα: 164n.

200

ἄπετος codd.: ἄπετον Koechly, Vian(*). —ος is supported by Hes. Th. (697-)698; cf. codd. xiii.433. An adjective seems to me to be perfectly in place, pace Vian: ἄηρ —the whole vast expanse of ἄηρ —is filled with fire. ἄθανάτοι : —ηεῖ Y: a slip, or a display of male chauvinism?

ὑπὸ φρένας ἔμπεσε : similar runs at ~~399infr.~~ i.675, ii.395; ὑπὸ φρένας (521n.) is dropped at 399infr., cf. vi.568, viii.314; xiv.73 ~ o 375. ἔμπεσε φεῖμα : cf. P 625 δέος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ/, ξ 88 δέος ἐν φρέσιν πίπτει /; E. Hipp.1218.

201

πάντων ... γυνῶ : ᾱ variation on ix.139-40 πάλῃσι δὲ γυνῶ / ἐτρέμεν ; cf. K 390 ὑπὸ δ' ἐτρέμε γυνῶ /, λ 527 τρέμον θ' ὑπὸ γυνῶ ἐκλέβου /.

καὶ ... εὐόντων : again, with different case-endings, at ii.181=iii.757; iii.52=hHerm.131; iii.600, and so Arat.104; Colluth.286. Without καί : Or. Sib.14.1; iii.111, x.131, xiv.82; with a different participle: ε 73.

202-3

Cf. in general Σ 616, and Υ 62 / φείδας δ' ... ἄλτο, O 123-4 Ἀθῆναι παλαιὰ περδείδα .. / ᾠρτο.

202

κλυτὴ Θέμις : unique [the likeliest supplement in Inscr. Cret.3.II2.30 is Bosanquet's Θέμιν κλ[ετάν], as are i.366(κ. Λητωίδεα), iv.48(κ. Ἥρη).

εἴτε νόημα : the same clausula, but with a different meaning, in Gr. Naz.1372. 267. This image goes back to the archaic period: O 80f. in expanded form, applied to Hera who is on a peace-keeping mission; hAp.186-7(Apollo) πρὸς Ὀλύμπου ᾧ χθονὸς εἴτε νόημα / εἴδει, id.448 ἐπὶ νῆα νόημα' ὥς ἄλτο.

πετέεσθαι/. Cf. also η³⁶ (hence Nonn. D. 7.316al., Met. 20.87), hHerm. 43
 (ὠκ-) ~ [Orph.] H. 69.9, ix. 462; Scut. 222; Thgn. IEG 985; Opp. Hal. 5.660;
 prose examples in Allen-Halliday on hHerm. 43. It is seldom found in Roman
 verse: Claud. Rapt. 201 is a fair try, Grat. 204 is disastrous.

203

δὲ νεφέων: A.R. 2.187, cf. X 309. τάχα ...: often in archaic epic with
 ἴκλινεν, ἴκνεσθαι, e.g. hAp. 218 τάχα δ' - υν - υ ἴκλινες/. εφέας
εὐαφίκανεν: cf. μ40al. (τέ') εφέας εὐαφίκτηται (-οίτο) /.

204

οἷ γὰρ [= Λ 74] .. ἀποπρόθι μίμνε: cf. hAp. 5 οἷ μίμνε, ix. 143-4; e 188
 /σῖος .. ἀποπρόθεν; K 209, 410 μένειν ... ἀποπρόθεν. δτονόεντος:
 qualifies μῦθον at ii. 517, ix. 139. Cf. 63n. μόθοιο: 22n.

205

τοῖον ... μῦθον: 24n.

206

ἰίχεσθ' ...: cf. Γ 82 ~ xiii. 334-5 (350 /ὥς φάτο' τὸ δ' ἐπ' ἰθύντο); iv.
 266; vii. 38-9 (sq. οὐ γὰρ εἶοικε, see below). ἰώχμοιο: Themis perhaps
 has in mind the notion of a πόλεμος (cf. Sud. s.v.) rather than a simple
 'guerre' (Vian), though ἰώχμος is often pretty colourless, cf. Gow on [Theoc.]
 25.279 and e.g. Opp. Hal. 5.247, Colluth. 325, infr. 286. Its precise sense in
 archaic epic is unclear, Trümper 160. δυσηχέος: 225n. οὐ γὰρ εἶοικε:
 cf. Φ 379 (έχεο ...), xiii. 409 (έχεο ...; ~ 415 /ὥς φάτο' οὐ δ' .. ἐπ' ἰθύνε).
 This is a common clausula in Q.; also 'Simon.' EpGr. 422 Page (~ IEG 6.5);
 Leon. HE 2159; Dion. Bass. F19r48; Anon. eleg. POxy. 2884, F2.11; Gr. Naz. 417.21al.;
 Pall. AP 10.47.1.

207

Ζητὸς χωμένοιο: 1463 πατρός χ. μινυνδαδίων: with ἄνθρωποι τ 328.
 For the attitude add to the examples quoted on 157-218 A 573-1; V. Fl. 5.
 624-5.

207-8

ένεκ' .. /μάρνεσθ': cf. 1327.

208

αἰὲν εὐόχτας : α 263a1. (θεοὺς ..) αἰὲν εὐόχτας/. εἴπει τὰχ' πάντες: for
εἴπει τὰχ' cf. Mel. HE 4658, and earlier Φ 309, hHerm. 255; the combination τὰχ'
πάντες in this sedes vi. 503, in others ω 353; Opp. Hal. 3.381, Nonn. 36.430.
πάντες ἀΐετο: cf. v. 426 corr. ἀΐετος is associated with καλὺπτειν (see
 211) xiv. 650f.; with φάος (213) vii. 41-2; with ἰόφος (213) iii. 480 and, in a
 different sense, i. 393-4. ἀΐετο means 'out of sight' (buried under a mass
 of earth and consigned to the subterranean ἰόφος, home of Ἀΐδης, 'the
 Unseen One' [cf. Lloyd-Jones, CR n.s. 15, 1965, 242]) and so to all intents
 and purposes 'anéantis' (Vian: ctr., pedantically, Scarcella 518); cf. Ξ 258
 (Zeus punishing Hypnos), and [Hes.] F30.21, 204.99.

209-10

ἤπερθεν ἀναρρήξας invites comparison with γ 62f., 'Aidoneus down
 below was terrified [see 180supr.] μή σ' ἤπερθεν / γαῖαν ἀναρρήξειε
 [~ Nonn. 36.103] πρὸς δ' αὖν', split it open above his head, so exposing
 his domain to all (cf. ἀναρρήξασα ... κολῶνας / in Arat. 642; tellure rupta
 in [Sen.] Oct. 136). So here perhaps 'splitting open all the mountains
 into one spot upon you from above', i.e. shattering the mountains and
 burying you under one huge pile of rubble (similarly Ar. Ec. 674, 'I'll make
 the city into a single house συρρήξας' εἰς ἓν ἡγλυντα', by smashing up
 everything and making it one big pile). This verb however clearly means
 'tear up' in Theoc. 22.208, A.R. 3.581 (suggested by H 461?), and probably
 also in Nonn. 2.267: 'Atlas ἀναρρήξειε .. πέτραις to hurl at the vault of
 heaven'. εἴφ' ἑμέας: H has the correct person here (cf. i. 330), but all the
 manuscripts get it wrong at 212 below, οὐρεὶ πάντα: iv. 141; ctr. A.R. 3.
 69-70 πάντα / οὐρεὶ. εἰς ἓν occurs in numbers past counting in post-
 Alexandrine verse. Some account of its previous history may be found in
 Headlam on Herod. 8.43; Livrea on 4.135 [where, however, some Alexandrine
 examples are missing]. Q. uses it in the following places; parallels are
 given where appropriate:— (i) ii. 559: cf. A.R. 4.1335; Opp. Hal. 1.615; Gr. Naz.
 1313.78; Nonn. Met. 11.190; Paul. Sil. Euphr. Soph. 733; orac. in Porph. an. Eus. FE

5.15. (ii)iv.239^κxiv.565:cf.Norm.37.525. (iii)(a)iv.308,xii.470=A.R.1.39;
 [Apolin.] 2.3,61.20,148.26;Anon.APlan.45.1;(b)vii.565=Arat.243;OrGr.204.2
 Hendess(?). (iv)vii.72:cf.Emp.F17.7,20.2;Ar.Ec.674(supr.);Gr.Naz.421.72;
 above all,Cleanth.CA 1.20 ~Honest.GPh 2412-3,(Herod.8.43-4). (v)xi.367.
 (vi)xii.210:cf.above,and Or.Sib.2.201,8.340 /εἰς ἐν συρρηΐσιν. (vii)
 xii.530.

210-11

ὠδ'...:cf. ω 223 οὐδ' ὤων, ἀλλ' ἄρα...; χ 221-2 οὐδέ τοι νῆας/...
 οὐδέ θυγάτρως/A.R.3.602 οὐδέ θυγατρῶν/.

211

πάντας δμῶς:apart from here and in an oracle ap.Luc.Peregr.29(Cougny,
 AppAnth.297.4,p.529) ἔνυ πάντας δμῶς, this unit always comes at the beg-
 inning of the verse: P 422, δ 775;A.R.4.808;Opp.Hal.3.264;GVI 1662.2
 (pentam.)=AP 7.342;SEG 13.277,8(Achaea,iv-v). So iii.601 / πᾶσαι δμῶς
 and (Q.7x) / πάντες δμῶς (= ψ 332,hHom.7.52,Call.Dian.169,A.R.1.475,514,
 4.642,Or.Sib.11.198,[Opp.] Cyn.4.136,[Orph.] A.1115,id.F245.2). Similarly
 / πᾶν δμῶς O 98,Hes.Th.672,A.R.3.174,4.256,Gr.Naz.402.12,[Apolin.]
 76.28 —but ἔνυ πᾶν δμῶς D.L.ap.AppAnth.46.2,p.400(pentam.).

καὶ ὑπερθε καλῶσει: ὑπερθε Ω. Prefixes of every kind fare so badly
 in the transmission of this text that ix.166 ὑπερθε κλῶσαν is unlikely
 to have been operative here. Q. is using Φ 321.

212

γαῖῃ ἀπειρεσίῃ:this is the only Homeric application(also A.R.2.1242-3)
 of ἀπειρεσίος taken over by Q.,in whom the word abounds:cf.iii.372,v.655
 -6,xi.417(~ γ 57f.),xiii.548-9. It is associated with καλῶπτειν else-
 where:iv.45,viii.444-5;iv.157. οὐδ' ἐλλεται... ἀλυσίς:cf.A.Ac.1299
 οὐκ ἐβ' ἀλυσίς; ἀλυσίς also i.478(/ οὐδέ ... πέλε...),Gr.Naz.442.
 49,445.85. The pattern negative: ἐβ' τι sim.: -αλυσίς is set by Homer(see
 Shipp,Antichthon 2,1968,16f.): X 270,cf.A.R.4.1261-2. Without negative:
 ψ 287;without verb:[Orph.] A.684.

213

εἰς φάος ... ἰόφως:for the opposition cf.Hes.Th.652-3 / εἰς φάος
 εἰπὲ ἰόφω,hDem.337-8 εἰπὲ ἰόφω../εἰς φάος ,hHerm.257-8,Archil.IEG 24.

17-18. ... δὲ περὶ is reminiscent of A.R.2.1105($\sigma^2 \xi^1 \dots$) ἐκ νεφέων, ἑκοτόεις δὲ περὶ σοφὸς ἡγήρεϊβτο. For the clausula cf.iii.773.

214

ὥς ... ἐπ' ἰθοντο=xi.221,xiii.350,cf.i.475($\tau\alpha\iota \delta^2 \dots / \delta\epsilon\mu\iota\nu\eta\nu \delta^2 \dots$); evidently a variation on / $\omega^2 \delta^2 \epsilon^2 \phi\alpha\theta^2$, $\sigma^2 \delta^2 \epsilon\pi\iota\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ (Ψ 249, Hes. Op. 69), / $\omega^2 \epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\nu \dots$, $\tau\omicron\iota \delta^2 \epsilon\pi\iota\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ (\int 71). Q. goes nowhere near the formulaic $\omega^2 \epsilon^2 \phi\alpha\theta^2$, $\sigma^2 \delta^2 \alpha^2 \rho\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha \mu\epsilon\nu \kappa\iota\nu\omicron\nu \eta\delta^2 \epsilon\pi\iota\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$. Διὸς τρομέοντες ὁμοκλήν=viii.479. The remote models are M_{413a1} . $\omega^2 \epsilon^2 \phi\alpha\theta^2$, $\sigma^2 \delta^2 \lambda^2 \nu\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma \delta^2 \alpha^2 \rho\alpha \pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma$ Ω 265) $\epsilon\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \delta\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\lambda\eta\nu$. The pattern is widespread in Q.: τρομέοντες -ήν /viii.385(cf.xiv.442); $\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\epsilon\kappa\omicron\nu$ -ήν /infr.446=iii.174,v.394,cf.viii.504;xiii.386; περιτρομέοντες -ήν /iii.364,ix.249, this last appearing also in [Apolin.] 17.35(-έεκον).

215

ὑεμίης δ' ἔρχοντο: a similar sequence in iv.269 / $\omega^2 \phi\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$, $\tau\omicron\iota \delta^2 \epsilon^2 \chi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\pi\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ ($\epsilon^2 \chi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ P, from $\epsilon^2 \chi\epsilon\theta^2$ 266), after Γ 84 / $\omega^2 \epsilon^2 \phi\alpha\theta^2$, $\sigma^2 \delta^2 \epsilon^2 \chi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\mu\alpha\chi\eta\varsigma$ ($\epsilon^2 \chi\epsilon\theta^2$ 82), ω 57 / $\omega^2 \epsilon^2 \phi\alpha\theta^2$, $\sigma^2 \delta^2 \epsilon^2 \chi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\phi\omicron\beta\omicron\nu$ ($\epsilon^2 \chi\epsilon\theta^2$ 54). For $\delta\epsilon\mu\iota\eta\varsigma$ cf. Theoc.22.174(v.1.) $\lambda\pi\omicron\delta\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\omega \delta\epsilon\mu\iota\eta\varsigma$ /, and vii.152-3. χόλον ... βάλοντο: Q.'s predilection for this turn of phrase appears to be shared by no one else: viii.266,xiv.153;xiv.296;xiv.177; infr.573(n.).

215-6

χόλον ... / ἄργαλέον: only Homer and Q., cf. K 107 and, in reverse, Σ 119, xiii.192-3.

216

φιλότητα ... ποιήσαντο: quite common in prose, here only in verse.

δμηθεα: also ix.405($\lambda^2 \nu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma \sim$ A.R.2.917 $\lambda^2 \nu\delta\rho\alpha\varsigma$), x.445($\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu \sim$ Anon. ethopoe. GDK 26.2 π 9 $\mu\eta\lambda\alpha$; Nonn. 5.364 $\kappa\upsilon\nu\epsilon\varsigma$). First in Alexandrine verse, probably widely used thereafter, cf. LSJ, adding the above and [Opp.] Cyn.1.446, Nonn.38.259, [Apolin.] 77.135, Max.392.

217-8

The underlying structure recalls Ψ 868-9 / $\eta^c \mu\epsilon\nu \dots \eta^{\eta\prime} \varsigma \epsilon \pi\rho\tau\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\nu$, $\eta^c \delta\epsilon \dots \tau\omicron\iota \gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$. The deities are rapidly dispatched (cf. introd.n.)

to their respective habitats, as in iii.781f., ix.323, θ 361f., A.R.2.298f.,
 Nonn.7.108f., 32.9f. Q. takes longer at viii.353f., but not as long as his
 model, E 864f.

217

ῥίοντο : on the orthography see Vian, Rech. 166-7, and in general West on
 Hes. Th. 71. ἔλσ' εἴω : i.635, vi.98. Homer has εἴω ἔλσ' ... κόλπον /
 (Φ 125), A.R. εἴω ἔλσ' (1.357, al.). Cf. P 265 ἔλσ' εἴω /.

218

α' δ' ... ἐμῖνον : cf. ψ 38. ἔνα γὰρ : also vi.246; not in early
 epic, but quite common in hexameters from the Alexandrine era on.

218-259

Odysseus exhorts his fellow-chieftains to enter the Horse. He calls for
 a volunteer to stay behind with the Horse. Sinon obliges.

There is a matching speech in Triph.120f., whose basic message is the same:
 the ambush is prepared; the chieftains must now show courage and enter the
 Horse with him so that the Trojans can take them into the city; the rest
 must go <to Tenedos>. But the similarities are far outweighed by the
 differences, not merely in ethos, but also in the treatment of Sinon. In
 Q. Odysseus ends by pressing for a volunteer, in Triph. Sinon is not ment-
 ioned at all until his discovery by the Trojans (219f.)—a necessary move,
 as Triph.'s assembly is attended only by $\beta\alpha\iota\lambda\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ (110), whereas in Q. the
 commons are present too (246, 259). We are dealing here with a topos which is
 in both imbued with the colours of an oratorical exercise (generically akin
 to the formal exhortation to troops prior to battle: note 223 ~ vi.607,
 viii.265-6; 224-5 ~ ix.278-80; 229 ~ vi.447, 604 etc. On this topic see Vian,
 ed. Nonn. D.1-2, p.78): as well as being the one who 'manned' the Horse (θ 495,
 cf. Lib. Enc. viiip.231), who organised and led the whole operation (λ 524;
 [Apollod.] 5.15; Lib. Eth. viiipp.427, 433), and who was responsible for the
 sack of Troy by virtue of the Horse (cf. Eust.239.15), Odysseus is also credited
 with urging the chieftains to enter it ([Apollod.] 5.14, cf. schol. θ 494)⁴³.

218

εὐπτολόμεοι δ' Ἀχαιοὶς :26n.

219

υἱὸς Λαέρταο :24n. πύκα ... μῦθον =iv.33, cf. vii.404 υἱὸς Λ. π. φ. ἐνὶ
 θυμῷ. Q. is the sole imitator of the Iliadic πύκα (...) φρον- : 1554,
 = 217;i.449;vi.84 ~xiv.165.

220

Q's archaizing tendencies do not extend to wholesale theft(ᾧ φίλοι,
 Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες):still, one would hope that he felt no
 pride in this line. For the form in general cf. H96. ᾧ νύ μοι :a
 much-vexed phrase(the cleverest suggestions are ᾧ νύ μοι, Lloyd-Jones 274;
 νῶ νύ μοι Maas, Kleine Schriften, Munich 1973,209), but this is unquestion-
 ably what Q. wrote, cf. viii.452 / ᾧ νύ μοι Ἀργείων δημάντορες, where νύ
 is hortatory, νύ μοι looking forward to the command expressed in the
 following lines(455f.). Q. uses νύ in commands, whether positive(xiii.
 281f.) or negative(ii.27-8 / ᾧ φίλος ... / μή νύ τι ...; x.284f.; x.
 313f. μηδέ νύ μοι; xiii.506f.; xiv.155 / μή ᾧ μοι; xiv.440 / τῷ νύ μοι
 ... μή τι). νύ here is undoubtedly eccentric:an answer to the question
 'how eccentric?' could only be given on the basis of a thorough examination
 of the use of particles in late verse, Christians included. The author of
 the 'Orphic Argonautica' writes Greek of a curious, but not unparalleled,
 kind; the Carm. of Gr.Naz. display a number of alarming morphological and
 syntactical features. ὀβριμόθυμοι :cf. vi.162 φυλακτῆρες... -οι /,
 and 322n. The wondrous ἔκριτόμυθοι is a splendid example of contamination
 from a preceding line(φά'-το μῦθον); in any case θυμ→μυθ would be
 an attractive proposition for many a copyist.

221

μοι εἰδόμενῳ :cf. viii.34 σ'-ω ; μ 438 -ω .. μοι. τεκμήρατε :
 'indicate'(as in A.Pr.604-5 ἑλγίστοι μοι .. τεκμήρον ὅτι μ' ἐπαμμένει παθεῖν),
 by volunteering for the mission. αἳ τινές ἐβτε :cf. hDem.119, [Orph.] A.
 820 εἰς αἳ τινές (αἳ τινές) ἐβτε ; δ 61 L174 αἳ τινές ἐβτεν (εἰβιν) /.

222

ἐκπαύλως : 'exceptionally', qualifying an adj. (not Hom.) also at xiii.349.

κρατεροὶ καὶ ἀμύμονες : cf. γ 111 ἀμα κρατεροὶ καὶ ἀμύμων /, and the common formula ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε / (Hom., Hesiod(ea)). For ἀμύμονες see on 75. ἦ γὰρ ἰκάνει : a run peculiar to Q. (iv.579 — νε /), but cf. ὦ γὰρ ἰκάνει (— ω) / in A.R. 3.350, Opp. Hal. 2.367, Nonn. D. 32.48, Met. 5.119, 12.186.

223

ἔργον ἀναγκαίης must be equivalent to ἔργον ἀναγκαῖον (cf. Kühner-Gerth 2.1.264). I have not encountered anything exactly comparable. ἀλλὰ

μνησώμεθ' Ἀργεῖος is an exact metrical equivalent of Homer's ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα χάρμης / (O 477 χ 73; cf. i.412-3); sim. vi.607-8 (δωμῖνός).

224

εὐξοον : cf. 328, 358, and the use of ξεστός in J 272, E. Tr. 534. εὐξοον ὄφρα = φ 281, 336.

224-5

ὄφρα τι τέκμωρ / εἴρωμεν πολέμοιο : cf. 2n.; iii.503 / εἰρέμεναι πολέμοιο τέκμωρ, an order found in Π 472 and Synes. H. 1.492; elsewhere the substantive comes first: δ 373-4, 466-7 τι τέκμωρ / εἰρέμεναι, cf. Hermesian. CA 7.93-4 τι τέκμωρ / εἴρε ; H 30f. μαχίοντ', εἰδότε τέκμωρ / Ἰλίου εἴρωσιν, ἐπεὶ ὥς φίλον ἐπλετο θυμῷ / ... , διαπραθεῖν τόδε ἔδτυ /, cf. I 48-9 (εἴρωμεν). — ὄφρα κε Koechly, and so Vian. If κε is expected, it cannot on any account be regarded as obligatory: the 'pull' of the common clausula τι τέκμωρ (δ 373 etc.) is operative here. [Vian* prefers κε with τέκμωρ denoting 'the true end' of the war rather than 'some/an end', considering that τι weakens the point].

225

πολέμοιο συνηχέος : Homeric formula, 7 times altogether in Q., also Or. Sib. 3.566, cf. 'Anacr.' EpGr. 65 Page. Also in Homer the formulaic θάνειτοιο συνηχέος, = vii.520, x.295, but apparently nowhere else. Q. associates συνηχέος for the most part with ἄχος (on this see J. Wackernagel, Kleine Schriften, Göttingen 1953, 957f.), but at times the link with ἦχος is clear: notably in (a) xii.381 θαλάσσης (Opp. Hal. 1.447 πόντον), cf. βαρυηχέος at

iv.60,v.245; πολυχηγής at xiv.539. (b)ii.351,xii.504 δ'μβρον, cf. βαρυχηγής at i.155. (c)x.70 ἀνέμοιο (sim.xi.123), cf. xiv.482 Ἄνεμοι κελαδεῖν αὖ (!) θυγατέες. In some cases either sense would be appropriate and Q. may have left his reader to decide. For πολέμοιο cf. i.376 +3(μόθιο); v.36 (ἔγμιναι); vii.125(ὁμάδοιο, on battlefield); xii.206(ἰωχμοῖο). Residual cases: x.235(ἰοῖ, cf. A.R.3.96); iii.519(γούιο).

225-6

ὥς ... / ἔβεται : ὥς γὰρ ἄμεινον / occurs in A²¹⁷, Hes. Op. 570, and later in [Orph.] A.839. [GVI 313.3 is doubtful, see Bernand on IME 77.3]. For ἔβεται cf. ἔβεται ἄμεινον / in Theoc. 4.41, Doroth. Cat. Cod. Astr. 6.106.184.

226

ἦν κε : the text here and at vii.215 ἦν κ' ἐθέλησθε / has found numerous predators in modern times, but both should be left alone: cf. Vian on A.R.3. 404, and Π⁴⁷ at id. 1.706, 715 (Henrichs, ZPE 5, 1970, 51 and 53f.); v.1. [Theoc.] 27.36, where see Gow. δολῶ καὶ μῆδεσιν : cf. Γ 202 (Odysseus) εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δολούς καὶ μῆδεα πυκνά; vii.275 δολοφροσύνη καὶ μῆδεσιν. ἀργαλειόειν : an ubiquitous epithet in this poem, but not as desperately inept here as Castiglioni (39) makes it out to be: ἀργ. = cruel: no compromises are possible now.

227

λίτῃ μέγ' ἐκπέρωμεν : after Φ 309-10 λίτῃ μέγα Πριάμοιο .. / ἐκπέρβει. λίτῃ μέγα is frequent in Homer but not particularly so thereafter (Bissinger 138); even Q. can muster only one more instance, iii.415.

227-8

οὐ εἶνεκα πολλὰ : Q. follows closely the pattern of π 188-9 (Odysseus to Telemachus: I am your father) τοῦ εἶνεκα εὐ στεναχίσων / πᾶχαις ἄλγεα πολλὰ (for xiv.631 Q. borrows from the related passage, v.310), B¹³⁸ οὐ εἶνεκα θεῶν ἱκόμεσθα /. — θεῶν μοιόοντες = γ 44.

228

φίλης ἀπὸ τηλόθι γαίης : a combination of B^{162a1}. φίλης ἀπὸ πατρὶδος αἰγῆς / and A^{30a1}. τηλόθι πατρὸς; cf. further v.540 and xiv.368. Q. may

have had in mind A.R.4.1208 γαίης .. ἀπὸ τηλόθι (ἀποτ- edd.), or A.R. at any rate may have been his source for ἀπὸ τ. (but ἀποτηλόθι / ἀπὸ τ. 6x in Gr.Naz.).

229f.

Neoptolemos had opposed the Horse on the ground that δολίος involved sacrificing βίη. Odysseus here cleverly combines them, in a way approved by Polyaeus (Strat.1, pr.3f.).

229

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ :ii.275,iii.522,x.11,suppl.ii.72. This is a common incipit in Homer, and reappears in Thgn.IEG 829, Theoc,7.35, [Opp.] Cyn.2.43, Triph.300; verse-oracles revel in this sequence, e.g.: ap. Paus.10.18.1 (Parke-Wormell 181), ap. Str.6.2.4 et al. (id.229). μένος ἦν :always clausul. in Homer (6x; cf. [Opp.] Cyn.4.8 καὶ μ. ἦν / ~ ~ 6; [Orph.] H. pr.13); always in this sedes in Q. (also i.4, iv.464, xi.235). καὶ ἀλκιμον υἱ ὄχ is a common pattern, e.g. E 529, φ 34; Tyrt.IEG 10.17 (ἀλκ. ἐν φρεσὶ); iv.482 (the first and the third in exhortations). ἐν φρεσὶ θεέδδε : θέντες (M) is a slip: Vian, Reoh.202. For the expression of. Φ145 μένος δέ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκε /, α89 οἱ μένος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω /; for the med. N121, δ 729, though, contrary to the practice of early epic (West, Philologus 110, 1966, 148-9) act. and med. are interchangeable in Q., cf. viii.15-16, xi.221 beside ix.85. For the clausula ἐν φρεσὶ θεέδδε / cf. GVI 2006.7 (Teos, i§ p): it is common with both act. (e.g. Or. Sib.3.164, 299; Gr.Naz.674.85) and med. verb (e.g. Theoc.24.74; Opp. Hal.3.479).

230

καὶ γὰρ τις ...: cf. B292, τ265, esp. ψ 118 / καὶ γὰρ τις θ' ἔνα φῶτα κατακτείνης ... All of these are followed by the generalising τε (Ruijgh, TE 739; cf. West on Hes. Op.21): cfr. Gr.Naz.1308.13, Pall. AP 10.56.5. κατὰ δῆριν : 7x in Q. Not Homeric (δῆρις hardly appears, cf. 90n., though it may have been more extensively used in other strands of archaic epic: 3x in the short Scut.); cf. Mnasalc. HE 2619; GVI 1153.1 = IME 10(ii-i); D.P.1051; Nonn.30.120, 261, 40.173 [interpol.26.151]. Ζηνὴν δ' ἀνάλκην = i.434.

231

λμείνονα φῶτα : λμύμονα (but λμύνονα M; for λμείνονα → λμύμονα cf. ω 374) is unlikely to be right, despite φ 325: cf. [Hes.] F195Scut.51 τὸν μὲν χειρότερον, τὸν δ' αὖ μέγ' λμείνονα φῶτα, and Υ434 ἐβόλος ... χείρων ~ 436 χειρότερος .. ἐών ; i.758 λμείνονι φῶτι .. κακὸν ... φῶτα κατέκτα: cf. Λ481 /φῶτα κατακτείνας, χ 29, ψ 118, Nonn.48.92; and for the clausula M 378N 170 λνδρα κατέκτα /.

232

μάλα γὰρ μέγα ...: for the form cf. i.116 μάλα γὰρ μέγα πένθος λείξει/, viii.454 (~ xii.585), κ 171, 180; infr.244n.; for the general appearance Scut. 96 μέγα ... θάρσος λείξων / (~ Nonn.9.194). μέγα .. λείξει : sim.xiii. 375; source: Z261, where μέγα is adverbial, not (Bissinger 161) adjectival. θυμὸν λείξει = viii.391, Nonn.20.285. Like clausulae in P226; Choer.Ias.1.1 Kinkel, Anon. APlan.27.1; A.R.CA 8.1, [Apolin.] 88.92; id.9.70, Paul.Sil.Ecphr. Soph.1001.

233

περ .. πέλει ... λνθρώποιον : see on 184. Dausque's τε πέλει is convincing: πέλει disappears before the following πολύ : μάλιστα is a crude attempt to fill the gap—either a reflection of μάλα in 232 or a 'translation' of πολὺ λῶιον, 'by far the best', superlative in sense. πολὺ λῶιον : 299n.

234

λλ' ... μέν : cf. P245 / λλλ' α'γ' λριστῆς ... The form of the whole is influenced by B437, 439-40 / αλλ' α'γε, κήρυκες μὲν λγειρόντων..., / ἡμεῖς δ' ... / ἴομεν, ὄφρα κε ...; cf. also β252f. εὐν : εὐρύν (codd.), if not a simple slip, may have been engendered by a recollection of B437f. (above)—εὐρύν 439. λόχον ἐντύνεθε : cf. ξ469 λόχον .. ἀρτύναντες/, and Vian here.

235-6

σ' δ' λλλοι εἰς ὃ κε : Γ 73, 256 / σ' δ' λλλοι ... ταμώντες/; γ427 / σ' δ' λλλοι μένετ' ...; Τ 190 / μ' μνέτε δ' λλλοι ... ὄφρα κε ..., cf. ι172.

235

ὁ δ' ἄλλος : see on 336. Q. has the article with ἄλλ- only in the masc. plur. (Svensson 83f.); A.R. is not much more adventurous (id. 39f.).

ἱερὸν : with reference to the cult of Apollo Sminthios (Fiehn, RE 2.5.496, cf. W. Leaf, Strabo on the Troad, Cambridge 1923, 240f.)—unless we are dealing here with a mere tag: see next note, and more generally Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm. 1.28.29. ἱερὸν ἄλκυ : ἱερὸν is not used with ἄλκυ in Homer (who has πόλις, πολυέθρον), but cf. Φ_{128} ἄλκυ .. Ἰλίου ἱερῆς /, $\Delta_{103,121}$ ἱερῆς εἰς ἄλκυ Ζελεῖης/. Q. has (i) ἱερὸν ἄλκυ in this sedes 351infr. (Troy), but (ii) $\frac{1}{2}$ νυ ἱερ. ... at xiii.338 (Rome), 558 (Troy)†, (iii) ii.242 + 3 εἰς Ἰλίου ἱερὸν ἄλκυ/. All three categories can be paralleled (cf. also Anacr. FMG 353.3 ἱερὸν ἄλκυ; E. HF 764 [Θηβας, v.infr.] ἱερὸν .. ἄλκυ; AnnAnth. 162.5, p.318 ἱερὸν .. ἄλκυ /): (i) Triph. 435 (Troy); Nonn. 5.85. (ii) [f.l.Call.Del. 287: Ἰριον brilliantly Pfeiffer]; IG 12(1)842.6 (Lindos, ia); Nonn. 13.77, 318. (iii) Claus.: Philit.CA F23; GES 64.7 (Sidon, iia; Θηβας, .., cf. supr.); orac. in Inscr.Magn. 215.1 (Parke-Wormell, 338; ip); OrSib. 13.96; EpGr. 1034.1 Kaibel (Chersonese, undated).

236

μῖμνετε εἰδοῖκεν: for the hiatus cf. 545infr. and Vian, Rech. 213; for the expression $\beta_{97al.}$ /μῖμνετ' ... εἰδοῖκε, vii.496 /μῖμνειν εἰδοῖκε (~ Hes. Op. 630 in a different sedes), x.14-15, xiv.219; also Man. 6.73, Nonn. 24.150 (ἀόχον γτήβαντες ibid.). ποτὶ πτόλιν εἰρύε: iii.210 (εἰρύβαντες /; for ποτὶ πτόλιν cf. X_{101} , § 472; infr.433 (.... ἀνείρυσον), al. εἰρύβωσι R^s , Tychsen: -6(6)ου6ι \mathcal{L} : there is no commoner confusion, but it is conceivable that the fut.indic. (Odysseus is confident) is in fact genuine: cf. $\theta_{318codd.}$, with Stanford's note. Q.'s own usage however tends to support regularisation (Vian*): εἰδοῖκε 9 further times with subj., once with pres.indic. (x.376).

237

See on 21-65(fin.). Odysseus assumes that the Trojans will automatically want to take in the Horse, a Greek offering to Athene, to their Athene on the acropolis. There is no talk of an inscription on the Horse, and it is

by no means certain that this motif goes back as far as Il. Pers. (Austin on Virg. A.2.32): E. Tr. 525f., 535f. could conceivably be hinting at one, and 386infr. could just reflect its phraseology, see n. ad loc. δη' ἴσιν ...

Ζ' ἔεθ' αἰ : one may recall Zen.'s version of 1594: δη' ἴσιν (: τ' ἄλλ' ἴσιν)

Ζ' ἔοντο : ~ 592 Ζ' ἔοντο : Q. 233; 592 Ζ' ἔοντο : Q. 235; 593 Πο' ἴσιν : Q. 236.

Fortuitous? δῶρον Ζ' ἔεθ' αἰ : Theoc. 1.9 (- ωντα /).

238

Cf. 33supr. (i) There is something inherently implausible in the notion that an 'unknown' of extraordinary courage can pop up after years of hard fighting. (ii) Even more implausible is the bystander's exclamation of 255, 'he was not bold before'. Sinon's prototype is of course a disguised Odysseus (360-88 § 2(b)n.); but a replacement 'ravager', Σίνων, is denied a formal disguise just because he is a replacement devised for the occasion, evidently to allow Odysseus personal access to the Horse. Q.'s Odysseus, it would appear, was content with a show of bravery; Q. might at this point have brought in the representation of Sinon as first cousin to Odysseus (see Austin on Virg. A.2.77-104) to justify selection on the principle of 'like father like son', though even that would have suited a trickster better than a strong-man. εὐφρα : often with εὐδέναι in Homer (normally in negative form): cf. v. 313, vi. 60. Τρῶες ἰβάνειν = v. 311.

239

Ζ' ἔχ' ἴπποισι : xiii. 30; cf. Ζ' ἔχ' αὐτοῖς in P 300, Ω 126; A.R. 2.94.

εἰδήρεον .. κῆρ : here only. In Homer εἰδήρεον (Ω 205, 521, cf. vi. 621), κραδίη, θυμός. ἐνδέμενος κῆρ : 34n.

240

The basic pattern is suggested by ρ 355 / καί σ' πάντα γένοιτο ὄνα ..., πάντα μέλοιτο [for the corruption μέδοντα cf. x. 343] by E 490, Z 441, a1. μάλα' ἐμπεδον : A.R. 3.1324 (μάλα δ').

240-1

ἐγώ γε / .. ἐφάμην : a common turn of phrase in Homer, e.g. E 190 O 251 ἐγώ γε ἐφάμην = ii. 311; v 356-7 οὐ ποτ' ἐγώ γε / .. ἐφάμην. For πρόβ' ἐφάμην cf. vi. 61.

241

μή τι ... ἄλλο : perhaps a recollection of β 303-4 μή τί τοι ἄλλο ἐν
στῆθεσσι .. μέλειτω . For καὶ μή τι cf. = 111al., iii. 780al. περὶ
φρεσίν : in Π 157 περί is very probably adverbial, as it certainly is at
 ξ 433 (cf. Call. F63.7, where πoλλόν perhaps hints at περί = περιδωρ).

In Q. περὶ φρεσίν (which is common) is apparently always a metrically con-
 venient substitute for ἐνὶ φρεσίν : cf. here ii. 10, iii. 347, x. 344-5, xiii. 376-
 7; and [Orph.] A. 891. See 396n. (περὶ θυμῷ). περὶ ... νοήσῃ : Homer has
 νοεῖν with μετὰ/ἐνὶ φρεσίν, κατὰ φρένα, and often with ἄλλα (as γ 26
 ἄλλα ... ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βῆσι νοήσεις /); cf. A. R. 3. 948 ἄλλα νοήσαι/, where Π²⁴
 had a [lost] marginal variant: ἄλλο ?

242

At xiii. 26 τὰχ' αὖ (sc. μή) ἀμφαδὰ πάντα γένηται / Q. recalls τ 390-1
μή ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα γένοιτο /; here he reflects rather the variation of
 A. R., 3. 615 (μή ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα πέλοιο), for which clausula cf. κ 223,
hHerm, 454 ἔργα πέλοινται / . Τρωσὶν Ἀχαιῶν : cfr. Δ 156 Ἀχαιῶν Τρωσέ .
Ἀχαιῶν ἔργα : Triph. 252 applies ἔργον Ἀχαιῶν / (H 465, = τείχος) to the
 Horse.

243-253

provide an interesting correspondence with Hes. Th. 167f. (Gaia approaching
 sons to punish Οὐρανός) :- /ὣς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄρα πάντας ἔλεν δέος
 θαρσύνων δὲ .. Κρόνος προσηΐδα ... / μήτερ, ἐγώ κεν τοῦτό γ'
 σποχόμενος τελέσαιμι ἔργον, ἐπεὶ ... οὐκ ἄλεγι' ἴβω / ... γὰρ ... / ὣς
 φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ μέγα ...

243

Cf. infr. 297, and for ἀπαμείβετο the Homeric τὸν δ' αὖτε (Αἰνείας κτλ.)
ἀπαμείβετο φώπῃσιν τε (γ 199 and often in Od.) : D thrusts in the unit
φώπῃσιν τε here. κύδιος ἀνὴρ : 183n.

244

ἄλλων ... γὰρ : after ξ 60 / αἰεὶ δειδίωτων , Φ 24 (= ii. 344) / δειδίοτες'
μᾶλα γὰρ ... μᾶλα ... ἔργον : cf. infr. 359 (and 232n.) ; γ 261 - ων' μᾶλα
γὰρ μέγα μήσσω ἔργον / , Τ 150 γὰρ μέγα ἔργον υ - x .

244-5

ἐμείλλεν/ἐκτελέειν = κ 26-7. Cf. i. 132-3 (corr.) γὰρ μέγα ἔργον/ἐκτελέειν; iii. 717; γ 275, [Hes.] F195 Scut. 22, 38. On ἐμείλλεν see 48n.

245

τῷ καίμιν : Z 353; A.R. 2. 455; Opp. Hal. 5. 70, 632; xiii. 414. εὐφρονέοντ' ἀνὰ θυμόν : on the face of it 'le sang-froid de son coeur' (Vian), but see on 53. For the form cf. B 36 Σ 4 / τὰ φρονέοντ' ἀνὰ θυμόν, and for the clause C.L. Struve's attractive suggestion at iv. 358 εὐφρονέην ἐνὶ θυμῷ / (ἐν ζέθλῳ codd.; Homer has φίλα/κακὰ φρον(έην) ἐνὶ θ. /).

246

εὐρύς .. λαός : cf. i. 94-5 εὐρέα λαὸν .. / Ἀργείων, and Homer's στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν / (~ iii. 494, iv. 16, vi. 192), στρατῷ εὐρεί λαῶν / (Δ 76). There is no exact parallel for ἡῦς (codd.), but Gr. Naz. 1242. 185 has στρατὸν .. ἡῦν / [cf. the f.l. at viii. 99], and given Q.'s use of ἡῦς in other places (117n.) one might justify it here at a pinch as an equivalent of Homer's Ἀργείων ἱερός στρατός (ω 81, cf. ii. 122 [see however Kakridis 28]; for ἱερός in this phrase see v. Martitz, art. cit. below on 351, p. 301). In this kind of context however the notion of size is regularly present, e.g. supr. 148. 'ἡῦς < εὐφρονέοντ' (245)?' (Vian*). ὁ δ' ἐν μέεσσι σιν = Ω 162 (-61) = iv. 337; cf. π 336.

247

ὦ Ὀδυσσεύ : Λ 430 (preceded by ἔειπεν /), Ξ 104, λ 363, ν 4; v. 181, 292, vi. 85. All begin a speech. Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατοι υἱες = i. 776, iii. 381, vi. 44, xiii. 297 [variations: ii. 3, viii. 3 ~ iii. 5-6, iv. 28 ~ GVI 1157. 2 (Crete, ia); iii. 659]. Homer has the formulaic clausula υἱες Ἀχαιῶν/, admitted only sparingly by Q. (x. 347, xiii. 486; ctr. xi. 405, xiv. 230). Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατοι : cf. H 289, [Hes.] F198. 6 Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατος - x. φέρτατοι υἱες : A.R. 4. 1383 φέρτατοι υἱες ἀνδράκων/, cf. Rhian. CA 25. 4 ~ v. 1. O 526.

248

Cf. K 303 τόδε ἔργον .. τελέσειε /, Ψ 559 ἐγὼ ... τὸ τελέεω/, and for the last two words vii. 222, infr. 280.

249

For εἴ τε μ' ... καὶ εἴ ... Vian refers to [Orph.] A.287 εἴ τε καὶ εἰς Κόλχους καὶ εἰς ἄλλοδαπούς ἀνθρώπους. But Sinon means, I think, 'whether they... [for subjunctive here cf. M²³⁸⁻⁴⁰] and <even> if they...'. A clear example of εἴ = etiamsi is Musae.203-4 εὖν δὲ ἔρωτα καὶ ἄγριον ὄδμα πρὸς ἑμῶν, / εἴ αὖτις παφλαῖσσιτο ... (cf. Y³⁷¹, 'I shall confront him, καὶ εἴ πρὸς χεῖρας εἴοικεν'; the statement 'καὶ' gehört zu dem folgenden εἴ', Kost ad loc., is not strictly true). See Vian, REA 75, 1973, 92.

249-50

πρὸς .. / βάλειν: in Homer the preposition εἴν is used (/ 220al.): cf. xiii.273corr.

250

ἴσων εὐόντα = Π⁴³⁶, ix.56. τὸ γὰρ νῦν: ctr. N²⁵⁷ τὸ νῦν γὰρ. τὸ ... θυμῷ: after π 28 ὡς γὰρ νῦν [~ x.220] τοὶ εὗρε θυμῷ /; similar is xiii.283-4 (cf. x.431 ~ 340 P 647).

251-2

Q.'s Sinon has a clear choice—to die, or to confer κῆδος upon the Argives (somewhat similar is Catul.64.102). The alternatives that face him in Virgil (A.2.61f. in utrumque paratus, / seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti) are formulated differently: Sinon's success depends upon his ability to deceive: in Q. Sinon must escape, and his survival depends upon his ability to brave torture (see on 360-88, § 2(a)). Still less like Virgil are the alternatives put to the Greeks by Odysseus in Triph.126f., χρὴν ἴσοντας ἀνιδίμον ἔργον ἀνύσσει / ἢ θανάτῳ βροτόεντι κακοκλέες ἀέχουσι ἄλυσαι [cf. 301-2n.]. Cesareo states that the similarities are 'undeniable' (p.244), as they would be practically bound to be for one who can claim (p.238) that Triph.'s οὐ μὲν γὰρ (251) is Virg.'s at Canys et (35) or argue: 'non è precisamente quello che dice Virgilio? No, ma...' (p.237).

251

σηΐσιβιν ὑπ' ἀνδράδειν = vii.46. cf. / 317 P¹⁴⁸ σηΐσιβιν ὑπ' ἀνδράδειν, a phrase which should be in the text of Dion. Bass. F24₇. ὑπ' ἀνδράδειν η 68

and often later.

252-4

For threefold μέγα see 49n.

252

μέγα κύδος :cf. Θ 176 etc., i.108 etc., Bissinger 153-4. The line as a whole is reminiscent of Χ 217. κύδος .. φέροντα :cf. ix.29.

253

So, in a similar context, vi.315 ὡς φάτο θάρβαλέντι, Τρῶες δ' ἐπὶ μακρὰ χάροντο, the bare bones of which exist already in Π 600 / ὡς ... μέγα δὲ Τρῶες κεχάροντο /. For Ἀργεῖοι here cf. δ 344 ρ 135 κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί / ~ ix.445 κεχάροντο δ' Ἀχαιοί /.

254

καὶ τις ἐφῆ :xiv.602. These are the only two cases in Q. where speech and line beginning do not coincide: for other examples in Greek verse see Hight, HSCPh 78, 1974, 188-9, adding Antim. F70, Call. F1.7, al. Hight's assertion that 'these late authors [viz. Q. and Nonnos] ... were attracted by the freer movement of Latin epic' is not supported by any solid evidence. The whole topic is in urgent need of examination. ΤΙς :for τις— routines see Kost on Musae. 73. The 'typical reaction' of delighted surprise (common in such sequences) is tempered by a 'one thing or the other will happen' (257 ἢ ὦν) reminiscent of Δ 81f. For ὡς ... ἡμέρον cf. i.358-9 (255n.) and ὡς in κ 38al.; for οἶομαι cf. i.363, 366, iv.22, 28, and εὐόλπα in A.R. 2.147.

θεὸς ... εἴδωκε : A 178, τ 396. μέγα θάρβος εἴδωκε :cf. Opp. Hal. 2.558, 5.628 μέγα θάρβος υ—χ, and Nonn. 40.32 σὲ θάρβος εἴδωκε, id. 30.231-2. θάρβος (Koechly) is not absolutely certain, see on 60-1.

255

ἡμέρον' οὐ γὰρ : γ 211; i.327 (ὡς), iii.520. Q. is thinking of Θ 141-2 τοῦτω.. Ζεὺς κύδος ὀπάσει / ἡμέρον ; cf. also Η 291 / ἡμέρον ... εἰδόμε δαίμων /. For ὡς followed by ἡμέρον add to the above i.358-9, iii.344-5, xiii.359-60. ἄλλ' ἐ δαίμων : ἐ δαίμων is a clausula in ρ 243= φ 201. Elsewhere the sequence ἄλλ' (i) με (ii) ἐ δαίμων / :- (i) π 194, ω 306;

A.R.3.389($\omega\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$); Argent.GPh 1395 [=GVI 980] and Phil.id.2823;GVI 1109.3 (Attica,iip?),2034,7(Pholegandros,iip); [incipit:Anon.ap.Cougny,AppAnth. 290.3,p.339]. (ii) σ 146;Thgn.IEG 1333;Nonn.47.169. —It is debatable whether in using such a traditional run Q. even stopped to reflect on the formal relationship between $\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omega\nu$ and $\theta\epsilon\sigma\varsigma$ 254(for the equation see \bigcirc 468~473 [interference on battlefield]); on $\delta\alpha\iota\mu\omega\nu$ in Q. see Kakridis 168-9.

256

$\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\theta\iota \dots \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\theta\iota$:an identical pattern in Bion F14.4 $\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\theta\iota \kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\nu \dots \tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\theta\iota$ /. Cf.i.126-7~E63-4; π 103;E.F1082Nauck [=Alexandr.F45 Snell,but the attribution is by no means certain,cf.Coles 30] bears a strong epic stamp: $\text{Ζεύς} \dots \kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota', \pi\eta\mu\alpha \delta' \epsilon\iota\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota / \theta\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu \gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\theta\iota \dots$ [cf.49n.] .

257

$\eta^1 \nu\omega\iota\nu$ = σ 168, but here $\nu\omega\iota\nu = \eta^1\mu\iota\nu$, as often in Q.,cf.Buttmann 1.48 and, perhaps(see van Groningen,Mnemosyne 5,1952,231), the use of $\nu\omega\iota\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma$ in Euph.CA 9.9. $\langle\upsilon\rangle\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$:e.g. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (Koechly) or $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda'$? (ego,cf.Arat.198, A.R.4.197);Vian* favours the latter. For $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota \dots \epsilon\beta\epsilon\theta\iota$ / cf. E 644. $\epsilon\beta\beta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\varsigma \pi\epsilon\rho$: $\pi\epsilon\rho$ reinforces the adverb:Denniston,Ck.Part.²482. Cf. the clausula $\epsilon\beta\beta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\varsigma \pi\epsilon\rho / (\Lambda$ 554 etc.,xiii.186).

258

$\lambda\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\sigma$ =vi.497,claus.ii.76($\kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\rho\gamma.$ =Gr.Naz.1505.348),x.95, pentam.- $\epsilon\mu\omega$ Tyrt.IEG 11.8;cf. Ξ 87 /- $\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ - $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, Hes.Op.229 /- $\epsilon\omicron\nu$ - $\omicron\nu$. The reverse order of ω 531 is unique. $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\sigma\iota\tau\omicron \tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\omega\rho$:2n. $\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\omega\rho$ $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\lambda\omega\nu$: $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\lambda\omega\nu$ is not at home in epic, and Q. may have written $\lambda\rho\iota\delta\eta\lambda\omega\nu$ ($\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\lambda\omega\nu$ a vulgarisation). For the phraseology cf.($\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\omega\rho$:-) $\epsilon\nu\chi\rho\gamma\epsilon\varsigma$ ([Hes.] F273.2), $\epsilon\mu\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ (A.Ch.667), $\epsilon\kappa\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ (id.Eu.244).

259

$\omega\varsigma \dots \tau\iota\varsigma$:562n. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \lambda\alpha\omega\nu$:cf. B 163a1. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \lambda\alpha\omega\nu$ ($\lambda\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$). $\lambda\rho\eta\iota\phi\iota\lambda\omega\nu \tau\iota\varsigma \lambda\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$:founded on Z 73a1. $\lambda\rho\eta\iota\phi\iota\lambda\omega\nu \delta\pi' \lambda\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ /; $\tau\iota\varsigma \lambda\chi\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ / M 390 etc.

Pleasantries are exchanged by Neoptolemos and Nestor, who is ready to forget his years and join the ambush.

Dreams of past glory figure both in Il. and in Od. as a means of pulling in extraneous mythical material^{Δ1}. The most memorable practitioner of this device is Nestor, spectator operum multorum, who normally (ctr. A 260f.; ii. 323f., where note ἡ βῶντι 328, γῆρας 330, ἔμπεδοι κτλ. 333-4, κάρτος 335) combines a wish for his lost youth and strength with an 'as at the time when...' clause to herald the reminiscences. Here the chief model is Δ 313f., Agamemnon to Nestor:

ὦ γέρον, εἴθ' ὥς θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν,
ὥς τοι γούναθ'. ἔποιτο, βίη δέ τοι ἔμπεδος εἴη.
ἀλλὰ σε γῆρας τείρει δμοῖον,

and the reply:

319 . . . ὥς ὅτε . . .
321 νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὀπάζει
322 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς ἵππευσι μετέβρομαι.

We have had a comparable routine already in iv.303f. (the Games: note 306-7 ὥς εἴθ' ἐν γυίοισιν ἐμοῖς ἔτι κάρτος ἔκειτο / σῖον θεῶ ἀντίθεον Πελίην κατεδάπτομεν ἡμῆς, 309 / ὀππότ' ... , 320-1 / νῦν δέ με γῆρας ἔπεισι καὶ ἀλγέα ..., 322 / κούδος γὰρ κτλ.), where the main model is Φ 626f. (note esp. 629-30, 643-4).

In similar vein, H 132f. (cf. 153, his ἀρότος, 157 βίη ... ἔμπεδος), A 670f. Examples of Nestorean digressions are reported in Cypr. 114f., Il. Parv. F2 Allen, Euph. CA 65(?), 66, and other individuals adopted his mannerisms: cf. Σ 468f. (beggar Odysseus); H. Heracl. 740f. (Iolaus); Virg. A. (5.397f. Entellus) 8.560f. (Evander); V. Fl. 1.336f. (Aeson); Stat. Ach. 1.776f. (Lycomedes, cf. Juhnke, op.cit. on 12-18 supr., 70.496).

267-70: 'A speech by Nestor about his youthful prowess offered a convenient opportunity for the invention of the poet' (Willcock, CC n.s. 14, 1964, 143). Q. appears to be following in Homer's footsteps: neither his

present claim nor that of iv.307f. is attested elsewhere. Here Nestor's desire καταβήμεναι εἰς Ἀργὴν is contrived as a parallel for entry into the Horse(cf.272),and it looks as if the motif of Pelias' obstruction(270)is an example of myth-manipulation suggested by A.R.1.323(Pelias did not want Acastus [a relative of Nestor's] to participate in the expedition)—— particularly as Nestor did not achieve his goal on that occasion or on this(see 270). Nestor is an Argonaut(a very inactive one)in V.Fl.,and he is found in the company of other Argonauts [in his prime] at the hunting of the Calydonian Boar in Ov.Met.8.313.

260

Νέεττωρ δ' αὖθ' ... μετέειπεν : from γ^{345,411} / Νέεττωρ (δ') αὖθ' , H 123 / Νέεττωρ δ' ... μετέειπεν / . δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν : similarly O 501 / Ἄλκιος δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν , Π 755(/ Ἑκτωρ δ'), ii.453 / Μέμνων δ' αὖθ' — ὡς . For the sequence here cf. iv.32-3 / ὡς ἄρ' ἔφη .. πρὶν ... / Ἄλκιος δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ... φαίτο μῦθον / , and for ἐτέρωθεν associated with the delivery of a speech A 647, π 43, v.1. hHerm. 366. ἐποτρύνων μετέειπε : ctr. ix.536 μετέειπεν ἐποτρύνων , and N 94a1. ἐποτρύνων ... προσηύδα / , A.R.1.656, a1.

261

So at K 43f. Agamemnon begins a speech with / χρεὼ βουλῆς ... ὦ Μενέλαε / κερδαλέης The line has something in common with Virg. A.6.261(Knight, CQ 26, 1932, 179.14). χρεῖώ : an urgent, pressing need. On the word see G. Redard, Recherches sur ΧΡΗ, ΧΡΗΖΘΑΙ, Paris 1953, 67 et circa.

φίλα τέκνα : K 192(... προσηύδα / ὄϊον ὦν, φ.τ.), hDem. 138; in this sedes also i.426 ~ infr.498, vi.59=xiv.235, and Ion IEG 26.11, Theoc.24.22, [27.] 32, GVI 1050.9(Thasos, ii-iii) [Opp.] Cyn. 2.360 +2, Gr. Naz. 539.222, 553.409, [Apolin.] 33.21 +2, Colluth.85. βίης καὶ θάρσεως : cf. on 99. This combination is not new: A.R.4.273-4 βίη καὶ κάρτε' θάρσει τε , of. [Orph.] A.249 θάρσος τε βίην τε / .

262

τέρμα πόνοιο : [Opp.] Cyn. 1.513, claus. id.4.440; earlier A. Pr. 183 πόνων

100
... τέρμα · ζυμύονα νίκην means, I think, 'victory which nobody (among us) would fault', a wink at Neoptolemos' opposition, reinforced by εἰλδ. and φίλας in the following line. Vian* accepts this.

263

ἡμιν εἰλδομένοιαι: also at viii.259, a reversal of ω 400 - οίβι .. ἡμῖν / φίλας = 'welcoming', as at Pi. P. 4.239f. πρὸς δ' ἑταῖροι καρτερόν ἔνδρ φίλας ὤρεγον χεῖρας and often. The unit φίλας .. χεῖρας is Homeric (H 130 μ 331), but note also Theoc. 7.104 φίλας ἐς χεῖρας ἐρείβας / ἐς χεῖρας ἔχουσιν: Scut. 107 / βὰς ἐς χεῖρας ἔχουσιν (κλέος ibid. ~ infr. 265, cf. id. 339 Athene / νίκην .. χερδὶν καὶ κόδος ἔχοντα / ν Q. 262f., 273).

264

θαρβαλέως H: -έος Y. This and the opposite confusion are common, e.g. vi.305; σ 330, 390; Rhian. CA 1.6; Antiph. GPh 854; Opp. Hal. 3.350, 5.27.

Πολυχανδέος: an obvious word for the Horse, and no doubt traditional, cf. infr. 307, Triph. 412 (and 535 π. ἐνδοθι). Πολυχανδής is popular with late versifiers: Q. applies it to a cave at ix.390; and to various vessels at ii.136, iii.731, iv.475 (cf. Theoc. 13.46, Nic. Ther. 951, [Orph.] A. 579-80); with νηδύς i.527, xiii.138, as in Opp. Hal. 5.331, [Apolin.] 16.32 (cf. εὐχανδής in Nic. Alex. 63, and Gr. Naz. 975.66). ἐνδοθεν ἵππου: again infr. 272, 340, xiv.139. Triph. writes ἐνδοθεν ἵππου / (357).

265

ἐπεὶ ... θάρβος bears a general similarity to vi.46 θάρβος γὰρ μερόπεε κλέος μέγα. μέγα here of course with κλέος, common in Q. as in Homer (cf. infr. 290n.; Bissinger 153). μερόπεε: only substantival in Q., as almost invariably after the archaic period, Kost on Musae. 93.

266

ὡς ὄφελον with 3rd.pers.indic. (aor. or imperf., sing. or plur.) is the usual construction in Q. (18x; / αἴθ' ὄφελον ii.61, v.565), the only exceptions being v.194, 468; x.378 (1st.pers.indic.). The earliest example of 'adverbial' ὄφελον appears to be Alc. HE 20-1, cf. Gow-Page ad loc. and Hermann, Orphica 825; Koechly on i.729; Wackernagel, 199-200. μέγα κάρτος and μ. κρᾶτος

in this poem are dealt with by Bissinger 216, 221. ἐπὶ γούνασι codd.

Koechly suggested ἐτί on the basis of the similar sequence at iv.306. This seems better (but only marginally) than Spitzner's ἐνί, cf. A.R. 3.63; xi.165.

267

οἶον δ'ε' : cf. iv.307 (Nestor), and /οἶον δ'ε' in 1447 (aged Phoenix speaking) al., xiv.458, [conj. xi.196, but see Erbse 566]; infr. 409 etc. Αἰέονος

νίος : used by A.R., 1.331 and often. ἔω νεός : xiii.468; cf. [Orph.] A.

274. νεὸς ὠκυπόροιο : ὠκύπορος quite commonly of ships in ῥ. as in Homer (e.g. vi.19 = § 230). For the form cf. νεὸς κυανοπύροιο / (O 693 al. ~ vii.436) and O 704 νεὸς .. ποντοπόροιο /; in Homer the unit νεὸς - υυ - x is occupied by the epithet ἀμφιελίεης (Od. 5x): cf. Alexanderson, Eranos 68, 1970, 18, 28, 29.

267-8

νεὸς .. Ἀργῶης : in this order [Orph.] A. 86, 224, 533-4 (νηὸς Ἀργῶης), 879, reversely A.R. 1.319, 2.211 [= [Opp.] Cyn. 2.622], 4.554, 938, [Orph.] A. 619.

268

καλέεσκεν ῥιβτεῖας : cf. O 303, P 245.

269

πρῶτος ῥιβτήων : iv.471 (-τον). καταβήμεναι : here obviously 'embark'; this, I think, is what κατέβαινον means at Theoc. 13.21 (Argo), pace Gow ad loc.

270

εἰ μὴ ῥ' : often in Homer as apodosis of /καί νύ κε et sim., cf. iii. 515 al. For the ellipse '<and would have done so> εἰ μὴ ῥ'' cf. A.R. 4. 903-5. ἀντίθεος Πελίης : cf. iv.307. Not many people speak of Pelias in flattering terms; but Nestor is a close relative. λέκοντά μ' ἔρυκε : cf. η 315 λέκοντα .. ε' ... ἔρύξει / (~ [Orph.] L. 449 λέκοντα .. ἡρύκακεν); Π 369 λέκοντας ... ἔρυκε /, Φ 59 λέκοντας ἔρύκει / ~ xiv.148 ἔρυκεν /.

271

νῦν δέ με [= Φ 281 al.] γῆρας ἔπειβι = iv.320 (Nestor). ῥ. clings to well-worn models: A 29 μιν .. γῆρας ἔπειβι /, hAphr. 244 / νῦν δέ με ... γῆρας ὁμοῖον ἀμφικαλύψει /, Δ 321-2 (Nestor) νῦν αὖτέ με γῆρας ὀπάζει (ἰκάνει vulg. = [Apolin.] 36.52), / ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἵππευσι μετέβρομαι ...

ἄλλ' ἄρα καὶ ὦν : 6x, in Q. only. Cf. the Homeric καὶ ὦν (xiii.164), ἄλλ' ἄρα καὶ ὦν (i.599a1.), ἄλλ' ὅτ' ὦν (vi.395a1.), and for the general shape M_{320} ἄλλ' ἄρα καὶ ἰς /; v.424 ἄλλ' ἄρα καὶ τοῦ / = T₉₆, Gr.Naz.1461.139 and AP 8.103.3; viii.423 τῶν / = Arat.180, Gr.Naz.458.22; iii.265 τοῖς /.

272

νέον ἡβώνων : cf. /446 νέον ἡβώνοντα / (γῆρας ibid.), [Opp.] Cyn.2.581, [Apolin.] 68.66. ἐνδοθεν ἰππου : 264n.

273

θαυραλέως· κάρτος δὲ ... : it would have been surprising if codd. (cf. xi.449) had not presented θάρσος here. It cannot be defended by reference to γ 76-7 θαυραλέως· αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θάρσος Ἀθήνη / θῆχ' — Nestor has θάρσος already. The likeliest word is κάρτος (Pauw), cf. supr.266; vi.370-1 θαυραλέως· μέγα γὰρ οὐδ' ἀλέπετον ὥπασε κάρτος / Ζεύς (which protects θεός here against Zimmermann's μέγας cl.vii.383; cf. v.266-7; θ 498, a1.). A similar correction seems called for at xi.408 (but cf. 60-1n.). κάρτος ... καὶ κῦδος : 'physical strength and <consequently> success and its attendant glory'. κῦδος is a complex term and its precise nuance is often hard to pin down: cf. Fränkel, op.cit. (on 2 above), 80; Gruber 73f., 85f.; also (Vian*) E. Benveniste, Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes, Paris 1969, 2.57f. κῦδος ὁπλῶν : κῦδος ὁπλ— / is an Homeric tag (normally applied to Zeus) which many were happy to reproduce: Hes. Th. 438; Sol. IEG 19.5, 31.2; A.R. 1.511; Or. Sib. 2.138; Man. 2.344, 392, 3.48; Gr. Naz. 503.61 + 8; [Apolin.] 14.9. But first prize must go to Ar.'s splendid κοιλιτοπώληεν δὲ θεὸς μέγα κῦδος ὁπλῶν (Eq. 200).

274

See on 66. ξανθοῦ Ἀχιλλῆος : an obvious epithet for Achilles (for references to his blond hair see Pease on Virg. A. 4.590, p.471, adding Bacch. 27.34f., Stat. Ach. 1.162, Philostr. Im. 19.5), but the only case outside Q. appears to be Pi. N. 3.43 ξανθὸς .. Ἀχιλλεύς ; cf. Claud. IV Cons. 557 flavum... Achillem.

275

ὦ Νέετορ : K₈₇, a1. εὐμὲν ἔπει = v 297 (... ἐπεί τιν); ii.68 / Πουλυδάμει,

ὁ μὲν [= M231a1.; -μην Zen.] ἐῖμι ... ἐῖμι νόον ...: no doubt Q. has in mind α66(Odysseus) περὶ μὲν νόον ἐῖμι βροτῶν. Nestor lays claim to νόος at v.154.

275-6

νόον προφερέτατος ἀνδρῶν / πάντων: so Koechly, προφερέτερος codd. Given v.309-10 νόον ... πολὺ προφερέτερός εἰμι / ἑῷ ... βίη δὲ ... (cf. φ 134; θ 221 ~ [Apolin.] 141.16; see Kühner-Gerth 2.1.22) and ii.415 (πάντων .. πολὺ φέρτερος εἴμηναι ἀνδρῶν / (φέρτατος Spitzner; similarly φέρτερος in Antip.Sid. HE 393 is assailed by Gow, CR n.s.4, 1954, 5), this conjecture might appear superfluous (as that of Zimmermann at iv.267 certainly is; but v.462 ὑπερτάτη is correct, pace Keydell, Gnomon 40, 1968, 574: cf. A.R.1.1122). -ατος here however has a good chance of being right:-(i) superlat.+ ἀνδρῶν: Theoc. 17.4 (pap.; v.l. codd.: -ερσ); GVI 403.1 (Ostia, ii-iii); 1.562 μοι μένος ἐῖτι πολὺ -έτατον ἀνδρῶν / (it is ἀνδρῶν here which pulls Q. towards the superlat., ctr. θ 221; -έτερον Zimmermann). (ii) superlat.+ πάντων et sim.: θ 128 and often thereafter, e.g. Hes. Th. 79, 361; GVI 2030.20 (Syros, ii-iii) and 1732.1 (Isauria, iii-iv); [Orph.] F178.1. The only example of the comparative known to me is [Orph.] H.pr.2 προφερέτερόν ἐστιν ἀπαεῶν / (after Hesiod: leg. -άτη?).

276

Similar is iii.614 ἀνέρι δὲ τὰ χα γῆρας ἀμείλιχον ἀμφιμέμαρφε. Q. is again indebted for his treatment of Nestor to the language of early epic: cf. ω 390 κατὰ γῆρας εἴμαρπεν /, Scut. 245 (with the variants) γῆρας τε μέμαρπεν /; and for the form hAphr. 244 (271n.), Δ 314-5 (260-305n.).

ἀμείλιχον: Q. is fond of this word (cf. below 466, 483, 548), but he steers clear of all Homeric/Hesiodic associations. ἀμφιμέμαρπεν: an exceedingly rare compound outside Q., see LSJ; in tmesis at iii.334-5=vi.635-6; xiv.28-9 (conj.).

277

ὦς ... βίη: cf. Δ 314, and the formulaic βίη δέ (τέ) μοι εἴμπερος εἴη /, a favourite expression of Nestor's in Il. (H 157 Λ 670 Ψ 629). There is a variation on this at ii.(323-4 ~) 333-4. χατέοντι πόνοιο recalls

the form of A.R.2.316 $\chi\alpha\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\iota \nu\delta\omicron\iota\omicron /$.

278

$\tau\omega \epsilon\epsilon \chi\rho\eta$: the same phrase on Nestor's lips at H 331, / 100; also p 417; Panyas. F12.16 Kinkel; two Julians, in AP 9.368.5, 11.368.2. $\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\omicron\iota\omicron \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma \eta\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$: cf. infr. 345, and 131n. $\lambda\pi\omicron\nu\epsilon\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ is a licence borrowed from Homer; Wyatt, op. cit. on 4 supr., in this as in other cases overplays his hand in attempting to reduce the total of what he terms 'mistakes' [p.235] : but he will be interested in the presence of $\pi\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\omicron$ immediately above.

279-80

$\epsilon\varsigma \dots \lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\nu \dots / \beta\eta\epsilon\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta'$: cf. 28-9.

279

Neoptolemos is thinking of his own name ($\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota$; $\epsilon\delta\mu\iota\eta\varsigma = \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu$) : cf. ix.283, Triph. 54; Wernicke 101f., Rank 92f. $\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota \lambda\iota\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$: iv.297; claus. p 294, Thgn. IEG 241. Cf. v425 $\mu\iota\nu \lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\omega\iota \nu\epsilon\sigma\iota$. $\epsilon\delta\mu\iota\eta\varsigma \lambda\kappa\omicron\rho\eta\tau\omicron\iota$: 87n.

280

$\omega\varsigma \dots \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$: cf. § 131, 185 $\epsilon\upsilon$, $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\acute{\epsilon}$, β 201 $\eta\upsilon$ $\epsilon\upsilon$, $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\acute{\epsilon}$ / ; vi.47 $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma / \sim$ B10, / 369 (- w /).

281f.

Q. here indulges in extensive self-repetition. Cf. (i) Lycomedes' leavetaking of Neoptolemos at vii.292-3 $\omega\varsigma \phi\alpha\tau\omicron$, $\tau\omega \delta' \lambda\gamma\chi\iota\beta\tau\alpha \kappa\iota\epsilon\nu \gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma \lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\mu\eta\delta\eta\varsigma / \kappa\alpha\iota \rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\nu \iota\omega\chi\mu\omicron\tau\omicron \lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu \pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu \sim$ 312... $\kappa\upsilon\beta\epsilon \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha \dots$ (ii) Phoenix and Neoptolemos at vii.630f.: Ph. approaches N. whom he sees as a double of Achilles (631f.), kisses him (640), addresses him (642f.); N. replies courteously (ω $\gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ 668) ; 670f. / $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\iota\pi\eta\nu \dots \epsilon\nu \tau\epsilon\lambda\chi\epsilon\epsilon\theta\iota\nu \epsilon\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma \dots$ (iii) Agamemnon to N. at vii.689f.: 'you are really Achilles' son...., η $\gamma\alpha\rho$ $\epsilon\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha / \epsilon\eta\theta\iota\nu \delta\pi\alpha\iota \pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\mu\eta\epsilon\iota\nu \dots$ $\Pi\rho\iota\alpha\mu\omicron\iota\omicron \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta\alpha \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\lambda\epsilon\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\zeta\epsilon\alpha\rho\iota\zeta\alpha\iota$, / $\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\alpha \pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota \epsilon\omicron\iota\kappa\alpha\varsigma \dots$ '.

281

$\Nu\eta\lambda\eta\iota\omicron\varsigma \nu\epsilon\sigma\iota$: cf. B20 $\Nu\eta\lambda\eta\iota\omega \nu\epsilon\iota$, and for the type iv.566, xi.338 ($\kappa\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\eta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, Hom.); x.138 ($\Phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\iota\omicron\varsigma$). The Homeric patterns, not always

adequately assembled, are dealt with by Aitchison, Glotta 42, 1964, 132f.

282

A common gesture in Od.: cf. here π15-16 κύβεε θε' μιν κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ἄμφω
 φάεα καλὰ / χεῖρας τ' ἄμφοτέρως (sim.xiv.183; [Orph.] A.446); χ499-500
 κύβεον .. κεφαλὴν τε καὶ ὤμους / χεῖρας τ' (sim.xiii.533-4 ~ Nonn.4.200
 -1); φ 225. ἄμφοτέρως ... χεῖρας : so Theoc.22.130 / ἄμφοτέρως οὐ χεῖρας ;
 cf. Φ489; Arat.183. ὅς ἐ' κύβεε : cf. Θ371 ὅς γούνατ' ἐ' κύβεε , xiii.533,
 xiv.183. κεφαλὴν τ' ἐφύπερθε : xiv.45 (corr.) κεφαλὴν ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρην /
 is an adaptation of (≡ 184 and) ε 232 κεφαλῇ δ' ἐφύπερθε καλύπτρην /
 (ἐπέθηκε vulg., cf. κ 545 and West, PP 214). Cf. also δ 150 κεφαλῇ τ'
 ἐφύπερθε (τε χαῖται/).

283

εὐρέα .. ἰππὸν : 44n.

284

† αὐτὸς δὲ αὖτις + codd. The presence of δὲ in the paradosis indicates
 perhaps that the archetype had both αὐτὸς and αὐτόν. Koechly's αὐτὸν δ'
 αὖτε seems to me marginally superior to his alternative suggestion αὐτόν,
 ο δ' αὖτε (adopted by Vian, and cf. van Krevelen, Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 446).

γεραιτέρων : cf. γ 24 (Telemachus of Nestor) αἰὲν δ' αὖ νέον ἄνδρα
 γεραιτέρων ἐξερέεσθαι, where γεραιτέρων is a 'contrasting' comparative
 (~ νέος ἄνδρες supr.279); cf. Wittwer, Glotta 47, 1969, 63. ἐκτοθι μίμνειν :
 a claus. in iv.99a (but surely interpolated: Keydell, Gnomon 37, 1965, 39; Vian*
 disagrees), cf. ἐκτοθι μίμνων / in EpGr.1050.1 Kaibel (Ephesus, ivp+?). The
 unit appears elsewhere in the verse at X439; A.R.1.833; infr.344.

285

ἐέλθετο γὰρ πονέεσθαι : cf. δ 162 ἐέλθετο γὰρ σε ἰδέσθαι/. Q. has
 ἐελδομένος (-αι -ους) πονέεσθαι / at i.451, iv.263, 370, 479.

286

=vii.293. Cf. τ 252 / καὶ τοῖτε μιν ... προσείπεν /.

287f.

Nestor makes out that Neoptolemos has realised the heroic ideal that Peleus

set his son Achilles (/ 443) — an ideal not realised by Achilles himself, not at any rate in Il. (cf. Solmsen, TAPhA 85, 1954, 1f.). Odysseus in Δ506f. praises Neoptolemos for both his fighting and his speaking abilities to the delight of Achilles. That N. is his father's double, and can be expected to do what his father did (good or bad), is a constant theme in S.Ph. and in Q. (cf. Castiglioni 35; Vian on vii.631), as elsewhere: e.g. Ov.Ep. 8.3, 43; Triph. 54. βίη ... μῦθος : for the form cf. Δ42 βίη καὶ λυγρόνι θυμῷ / (adapted in v.199 βίη καὶ εὐφρόνι βουλή /, a clausula attested in [Orph.] H. 14.12 +4), and καὶ εὐφρόνι θυμῷ / in orac. ap. Paus. 8.9.3 (Parke-Wormell 163.4). εὐφρόνι : 'sagacious', cf. Fraenkel on A.Ag. 806, Vian on iv.130, supr. 53n.; ii.42 εὐφρόνα.. μῦθον / (ν 6 α σ φ ρ ο ν ι 41). LSJ Suppl. makes no attempt to improve upon the drastically inadequate treatment accorded to this epithet (or its congeners).

288

ἀντιθέον Ἀχιλλῆος : Achilles is only one of a number of important characters to whom the epithet ἀντιθέος is not applied in the Homeric poems (see Lex frEp s.v.). With Q.'s unit (also v.305) one may compare φ 254 / ἀντιθέον Ὀδυσῆος, and so xiv.276 ~ v.369; iv.385 ~ Δ 21a1. In Homer Achilles is δῖος, θεῖος, θεοείκελος; in Q. θεοειδής (xi.234), ἰεὸς θεός (xiv.180, cf. ἰεὸς θεὸν γένος in E.IA 626), ἰεὸς θεός (xiv.304), the last of which at any rate is not likely to be archaic, cf. West, CQ n.s.20, 1970, 284.

289

διαπραθείειν κλυτὸν ἄβλυ = viii.474 (H 32 δ. τόδε ἄβλυ /); variations in iv.544, ix.279-80, xiii.419. κλυτὸν ἄβλυ (Hom. ἄβλυ περικλυτὸν ctr. viii.478 π. ἄβλυ) is late: first(?), in order ἄβλυ κλυτὸν, in GVI 1042.2 (Rome, ii-iii), cf. Anon. AppAnth. 256.5, p.333; κλυτὸν ἄβλυ : Gr.Naz. 1538.227; [Apolin.] 47.14; EpGr. 887.1 Kaibel (undated).

290

ὁψὲ δ' ἄρ' : ix.210, cf. 366n. ἐκ καμάτοιο = ix.105, and Nic, Ther. 281, Opp. Hal. 1.26, Max. 161, Metrod.AP 14.136.5; init.hex.xi, 327, fin.A.R. 2.430, Nic, Alex. 291. μέγα ... ἡμῖν : 265n. For the form of the whole cf. P 131 μέγα κλέος ἔμμεναι ἀντὶ /; P 232, ω 94, hAp. 381 κλέος ἔμμεται — νυ — x; and Δ 227 ἐκ

θαλλῶσι μετὰ κλέος. Note further vii.663 ~ ω 93-4.

291

πολλὰ πονημένοισι : similarly iii.283(-νσι), viii.201(-νή). This unit is otherwise the property of the epigram: hexam., /πολλὰ-σι GVI 992.1 (Smyrna, ii-iii); pentam., /πολλὰ-οι, epigr. ap. Hellenica iv.p.115 (late empire); πολλὰ-ον(-σι) / Antip. Thess. GPh 460; GVI 1983.8 (Syria, iii p.).
πονημένοισι κατὰ κλόνον: cf. E 84, 627 πονέοντο κατὰ .. δὲ μινύην /; κατὰ κλόνον is Homeric. πονέειν δ' ἄλγεα nowhere else. ἄλγεα λυγρὰ: Γ 416 v.l. ant., N 346, Ω 742, Hes. Op. 200, Or. Sib. 3.301. Cf. x.326.

292-6

For a detailed discussion of this passage see Vian, tome ii, 203f.; also van Krevelen, Mnemosyne 19, 1966, 194. The 'roads' are associated, from Hesiod on (Op. 289f. note κακόν τε, ῥηϊδίως / ῥηϊδίη, θεοὶ .. εὐθὺς καὶ ὁδὸς ἐς ...; in the close imitation at Nonn. 20.94f. πόνος specifically is brought into the picture) with the attainment of moral goodness or evil: Nestor here resolves 'sufferings' and the vague 'good things' into 'ruin' (military disaster) and (cf. Sil. 4.603-4) 'glory' (military success). πόνος and κῆδος are brought together in i.738, ii.76f., iv.305 [Nestor], etc.; ἄρετή and πόνος in a related image, xiv.195f.

292-3

So Nestor in v.154 reflects εὐθὺς καὶ ἄλγεα πολλὰ μόγησιν, cf. vii.70f.

292

ἄλγεα ... θεοὶ : cf. T 264, § 39. παρὰ ποσσίν : likewise i.425 / ἡμῖν f' ... παρὰ ποσσίν ἄλγεα κείται /; for παρὰ ποσσίν metaph. cf. vi.63, 432, vii.549; Platt 116-7. θεοὶ θέσαν ἄνθρωπον = λ 274. θεοὶ [θεοὶ Antiphil. GPh 1025] θέσαν occurs / 637al., Margites IEG F2.1, D.P. 394, xiv.370, and cf. PLille 76 (anon. — Stes. ? — lyr. ap. Parsons, ZPE 26, 1977, 15) 205-6 θεοὶ θέσαν βροτῶν; θέσαν ἄνθρωπον / also Ω 49.

293

πολλὰν ἄπωθε : cf. τυτθὸν ἄπ. (vii.623, viii.118 ~ Theoc. 1.45 / τυτθὸν δ' ἔββον ἄπωθεν), βαλὸν ἄπ. (iii.728al. = A.R. 2.86, Diosc. HE 1544). ἄπωθε(v) (14x in Q.) is widespread in the imperial epoch. In verse first in tragedy

and comedy, in the Alexandrine era it is found not only in iambs (Call. F 194.97, 197.25; Lyc. 425, 804), but also in hexameters (A. R. 12x; Theoc. 1.45) and pentameters (Antip. Sid. HE 315, Diosc. id. 1544). For the form $-\omega\theta\epsilon$ see LSJ + Suppl., adding Lyc. 425. $\pi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu \dots \epsilon^{\prime}\lambda\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\nu$: at Δ 299 Nestor marshals the troops, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\varsigma \delta^{\prime}\epsilon\varsigma \mu\epsilon\beta\beta\omicron\nu \epsilon^{\prime}\lambda\alpha\beta\beta\epsilon\nu / (\epsilon\beta\theta\lambda\omicron\varsigma 298)$.

294-5

$\rho\eta\iota\delta\iota\eta \mu\epsilon\nu \dots \kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$: cf. A. R. 4.501-2 / $\rho\eta\iota\delta\iota\eta \delta\epsilon \kappa\epsilon\nu \dots \kappa\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ /.

295

$\alpha\iota\gamma\eta\sigma\iota$: 133a.

296

$\mu\epsilon\beta\phi^{\prime}\delta\tau\epsilon$: on this expression see Schneider, Call. 1.342 (he compares $\epsilon^{\prime}\omega\varsigma \delta\tau\epsilon$) and J. Wackernagel, *Vermischte Beiträge*..., Basel 1897, 35. Elsewhere in Q. it takes the aor. indic.: iii.623, viii.134; $\delta\tau\epsilon \delta\eta$ vii.621, ix.325. It occurs in the following places also:—(A) With indic.: (i) aor.: Call. *Dian.* 195, and (see now Lloyd-Jones/Rea, *HSCPh* 72, 1968, 128) F260.20; $\delta\tau\epsilon \delta\eta$ F260.4; Gr. Naz. 990.266, 1457.83, and *AP* 8.45.2; Max. 421. (ii) pres.: Gr. Naz. 442.41. (iii) imperf.: id. 537.195. (B) With optat.: id. 520.29. (C) / $\mu\epsilon\beta\phi^{\prime}\delta\tau\alpha\nu$ [Orph.] *A.* 1232. — $\mu\epsilon\beta\phi^{\prime}\delta\tau\epsilon$ tries to fight its way ~~back~~ into Homer's text at τ 223 (cf. Allen ad loc.), ω 310. $\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\delta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha \tau\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$: the other way round in Antip. Thess. *GPh* 469. $\delta\iota\alpha \pi\omicron\beta\beta\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\eta\beta\eta$: Panyas. F15.1 Kinkel ($-\eta\beta\alpha\varsigma$ /); a similar pattern in viii.156. — $\pi\epsilon\rho\eta\beta\epsilon\iota$ odd.: correct?

297

Early epic offers no exact parallel for this speech-introduction (sim. v. 306 / $\omega\varsigma \phi\alpha\iota\tau\omicron, \tau\omicron\nu \delta^{\prime} \omicron\delta\upsilon\sigma\eta\omicron\varsigma \lambda\mu\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron \dots$), but cf. Hes. *Th.* 654 $\omega\varsigma \phi\alpha\iota\tau\omicron, \tau\omicron\nu \delta^{\prime} \alpha\delta\psi^{\prime} \alpha\delta\tau\iota\varsigma \lambda\mu\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron \kappa\omicron\tau\tau\omicron\varsigma \lambda\mu\upsilon\mu\omega\nu$, N 823... $\delta^{\prime} \delta^{\prime} \lambda\mu\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron \phi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma \epsilon^{\prime}\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\rho$ /.

298

$\tilde{\omega} \gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ of Nestor Δ 313al.; so v. 166 / $\tilde{\omega} \gamma\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu, \omega\varsigma \dots$ $\omega\varsigma \dots \phi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\iota$: cf. xiii.412 $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime}\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha\varsigma$ /, xi.491 (corr.) $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime}\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\nu\iota \phi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\iota$. $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\pi\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\nu\iota \phi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ reproduces Φ 583; for $\epsilon\nu\iota \phi\rho\epsilon\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \nu-x$ cf. β 363 = o 326.

299

ἤμιν εὐχομένοισιν = γ56(-61), iv.42. εἴπειν ... οἴτω : evidently straight from Hes.Op.433 ~ /εἴ' χ' ἕτερον 434. Analogous clausulae at (i) infr.342 and (ii) ii.38, vi.30, xi.219 εἴπειν πολὺ λῶϊόν ἐστιν / = Gr.Naz.573. 673, 1476.355. [cf. A 229; β 169, Hes.Op.759. — Plato, Hp.Mi.370c, cites A 169 in the form εἴπειν ἥ πολὺ λῶϊόν (: φέρτερόν) ἐστιν /. J.Labarbe, L'Homère de Platon, Liège 1949, 71-79, so far from offering a convincing case for an original λῶϊον, seems to me to end up apologizing for it. Plato is given to substituting synonyms εὐκῆ (cf. Tarrant, CQ n.s.1, 1951, 62) and I see no good reason why a substitution should necessarily have been βέλτιον]. οἴτω (οἴτως Ald.) should be left alone: Schneider, Call.1.68. So now Vian*.

300

εἴ ... θεοί : cf. i.610 (corr.), x.427 θεοὶ δ' ἑτέρως ἐβόλοντο / (ἐβόλ - ?) ~ α 234 / νῦν δ' ἑτέρως ἐβόλοντο (v.l. ant. ἐβόλ -) θεοί. καὶ τοῦτο τετυχθῶς : Hes.Op.752 (τέτυκται /).

301-2

Similar alternatives are put in ii.39-40, xi.219-20. With φυγών Neoptolemos presumably hits out at the Greek 'flight' from Troy: he will stay with the Horse, which at least affords some prospect of a glorious death.

301

βουλομένην δ' : in all eight places in Homer where βουλομένην (... ἤ') occurs the modal particle is present, and so generally elsewhere (ctr. Cerc. CA 18.37 [p.218] and [Babr.] 65.7) : — Sapph. PLF 16.17; S. El.1304v.l., E. Hipp.904, al.; Com. Adesp.257.84 Austin; Antip. Thess. GPh 91(.... ἤ'); Gr.Naz.550.374(.... ἤ'). Perhaps (ctr., Vian*) we should read here βουλομένην χ' (with a dash after τετυχθῶς), cf. λ489f. π 106f. / βουλομένην κ' ἤ' ..., γ 232f. / βουλομένην δ' ἔν / ἤ' ἐλθὼν ..., υ 316-7 / καί κε .. βουλομένην ... / τεθνάμεν ἤ' ... Hermann suggested βουλομένην κεν εἴπ' Ἄρει (Orphica 747), but: — δ' εἴπ' Ἄρηι = E699. εὐκλειῶς ἀπολέσθαι : cf. x.43 / εὐκλειῶς + μέγ' ὀλέσθαι, X110 (ἤ' ἤ' ..) ὀλέσθαι εὐκλειῶς πρὸ πόλῃος / (but a Ptolemaic papyrus has π[ρὸ πόλ]ηος εὐκλειῶς ἀπ[ὸ λείσθαι, West PP 163),

Trag. Adesp. 537 Ναυκ κατθανεῖν ... ἐκλεῖψ/ῃ ἵπν θε'λοίμ' ἄν.

302

ὄνειδεα πολλὰ: Γ²⁴² [Γ⁴⁶⁰] ὄνειδεα ἀόλλ' υυ-χ.

303-4

Of the brief arming-scenes in Homer (Arend 96f.) this most resembles ψ³⁶⁶

ἦ ῥα καὶ ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἐδύετο τεύχεα κατὰ ~ 369 / οὐ δέ ... ἐθωρήσσοντο...

303

viii.23 ὡς εἰπὺν ὤμοισι πατρώϊα δύετο τεύχη. For Achilles' arms see Vian on vii.445. ὡς εἰπὺν ὤμοισι resembles Θ^{184al.} = [Orph.] A.854; cf. iii.349

=xiii.374. κατ'... θήκατο: one might expect 'deposit' or 'take off'

(cf. T¹²; Nonn. 46.89), but Q. clearly means 'put on', as at vi.196; cf. Campbell,

CQ n.s. 19, 1969, 279.4. ἀμβροτα... τεύχη: 174n. θήκατο τεύχη: i.152; cf.

Scut. 127 / θήκατο δ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ... εἰδηρον /.

304

πατρός ἐοῦ: also vii.710. Once only in Homer (J⁷¹⁴), but common later, e.g.

Theoc. 24.59, A.R. 1.117, Euph. PSI 1390Cii.17, Opp. Hal. 2.501, Gr. Naz. 1488.108,

Nonn. 6.27al. τοὶ δ' αἰψα: ix.131al., also K 359, [Opp.] Cyn. 4.328, [Orph.]

A.1099. cf. T³⁶ / αἰψα ... θωρήσσο. αὖτοι θωρήχθεν: cf. Λ⁴⁹ M⁷⁷

/ αὖτοι ... θωρήχθεντες /; H 101.

305

ἤρῳν σὺ ῥίετοι: A.R. 4.1307. The Homeric models are / Ἀργείων, Φαίηκων

σὺ ῥίετοι (i.779-80 σὺ ῥίετοι / Ἀργείων). σὺ ῥίετοι also ix.487,

cf. v.170 ~ Λ⁶⁵⁸. Compared with Homer Q. is conservative in his use of

article + superlative: Svensson 79f. — Ctr. here Virg. A. 2.18 delecta virum

sortiti corpora. ἕβσις ... θυμός: cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 4.374 θυμὸς θραύς,

and ii.312 θραύς δέ μοι ἔλπετο θυμός [~ P^{234al.}], ix.403 ἔ σὺ θραύς

ἦ' θεε θυμός [cf. 93n.]; i.822 [~ H^{31al.}]. ἔπλετο θυμός: iv.122; also

[Orph.] A. 234, 406 εὐδδ.; Gr. Naz. 1489.133; [Apolin.] 48.12.

306-335

(A) Invocation and (B) Catalogue.

(A)

This is the only Muse-invocation in the poem. The basic framework recalls B 484f. / ἐπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι ... / Σμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε / αἴτινες ἡγεμόνες ... ἦσαν / (cf. also A 218f., = 508f. [/ Ἀλκίς ῥα πρῶτος 511, v.1. μὲν, cf. Q. 314], Π 112f. A number of imperial poets were quite happy to perpetuate jaded ideas⁴⁵ — wholly deserving of the grotesqueries with which Nonnos thrashed them in 13.43f.

The personal elements of 308f. owe something to Hes. Th. 22f.⁴⁶ and to Call. F2(309 ~ schol. Flor. Pfeiffer, p. 11 α] *ῥητιγενεῖος ὦν*; 310 *μῆδ' ἀνέμωρτι* / ~ F2.1) or possibly to a more simple-minded derivative of the type found in POxy. 2816⁴⁷. The topographical precision of 310f. suggests that Q. was either born or lived in Smyrna, though given the mass of clichés and Smyrna's well-known claim to the mothering of Homer⁴⁸ the point may simply be that he sees himself as a representative of the 'Homeric' school of verse; at any rate, this passage is not on a strict par with the boasts of the Oppians (Cyn. 2.127, 157; Hal. 3.7f., 206f.) or of Nonnos (26.238).

(B)

For details of extant catalogues (they are not normally designed to be complete) see Robert 1238f., Kakridis 100-1. Each one is, as one would expect, idiosyncratic; speculation about origins, whether on an individual or a collective basis, seems pointless⁴⁹. Q. shares with Virg. (~ Hyg.) alone Sthenelus and Thoas, with Virg./Triph. the obvious Odysseus, Neoptolemos, Menelaus, Epeius, and also Acamas (see below; Triph. shares no individual with Virg. alone), with Paus. alone Menestheus (only here in Q.), with Paus./Triph. but not Virg. Teucer, Demophoon and Acamas, with Triph. alone Ajax, Eurypylus, Thrasymedes, Idomeneus, Leonteus, Eumelos, Meges. The lists of Virg. Triph. and Q. all contain individuals peculiar to themselves. Of those peculiar to Q. — Philoctetes (cf. Eust. on A 522), Polypoetes, Meriones (Eust.), Podaleirius, Eurymachus (321 codd.), Ialmenos, Thalpios, Antimachus (A at 323), Euryalus, Amphimachus (325 codd.), Agapenor — 1-4, 7 [see ix. 150 suppl.], 9 and 11 figure elsewhere in the poem; the source of the remaining four is unknown, as is of course that of the catalogue as a

whole: according to Vian (Notice, p. 85) Menestheus Ialmenos and Thalpios are names 'pris, semble-t-il, au hasard dans le Catalogue des Vaisseaux' — but, Thalpios apart (see above), Menestheus is there already in Paus., and Q. must be preserving a 'genuine', traditional member, Eurymachus (321) should not be jettisoned in favour of Eurydamas (Wernicke, comparing Triph. 181, where three -δαμας names are grouped together); but Vian's Ἀμφίμαχος in 323 (cf. B 620 Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Θάλπιος, 871 Νάβτης Ἀμφίμαχός τε; Ἀντίμαχος from M 188?) and Ἀμφίλοχος in 325 [but [Hes.] F 26.2... Ἀμφίμαχος κρατερ. [] are tempting if not wholly certain corrections.

Triph.'s catalogue is diversified with a wealth of personal detail⁵⁰. The fact that a catalogue is comprised of basically familiar personages is no obstacle to amplification, but Q. contents himself with a sketchy and downright monotonous list, which, to judge by the nature of the ornamental epithets (note repetition in κρατερός 315, 325 cf. 326; 'godlike' 316 ~ 322, 319, 324; ἐρίθυμος [318n.] and ὀβριμόθυμος are imperial in flavour), may well have been founded wholly or in part on a simple prose record or commentary. Neither Q. nor Triph. indulges in symmetrical patterns (Virg., 3x3). Triph. groups three -δαμας names (181-2), Virg. has the jingle Acamasque Thoasque (262); Q. eschews such devices and even splits up Demophoon and Acamas (325-6, ctr. Triph. 177).

306

ὑὔ: see Livrea on A.R. 4.1. καθ' ἑκάστην: the Muses have the power to enumerate each individual person or thing: cf. Ibyc. SLG 151.23f.; Virg. A. 9. 527; Il. Lat. 164, 166.

306-7

μοι ... ἀνειρομένω ... / ἐπεδ' ἔβου: cf. A.R. 4.1565 ἀνειρομένω διγίῳ ἐν ἰβέ /, and, with εἰπὼν, εἰπέ Mel. HE 4730 (= GVI 1868) ~ Paul. Sil. AP 5.250. 7 [Viansino 61]; Nonn. Met. 9.11; add perhaps Certamen 140-1 μοι .. εἰρομένη κατὰ λείπον, / πόβου ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδην εἰς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί; (ἀνείρ — ? Cf. Call. F 178.22 suppl., Gr. Naz. 1371.255, c.v.l.). The archaic prototypes are

Homer's /εἰπέ μοι ἐρρομένω-η (ο 263al.), reproduced in Nonn.25.327al., and in the mock-heroic Luc.AP 11.274.1 and Socr.AP 14.1.1f. Πυθαγόρη, Μουσέων .. ἔρνος, /εἰπέ μοι ἐρρομένω, ὁπότε μοι ...; cf. also Nonn.21.238-9. ἔλφα ...: with εἰπεῖν in Homer, e.g. Δ 404.

307

ἔεπεθ' : ἔεπετε is regular in appeals to the Muses: cf., besides the Iliadic passages cited on 306-335(A), e.g. Hes.Th.114 μοι ἔεπετε Μοῦσαι, the alternative first line of Il. /ἔεπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι, and Colluth.6, where as here there is a variant εἰπατε. For R's spiritus asper ~~cf.~~ Allen, Il.ed.maior, on B484, ≡ 508, Π112; schol. B 484^a 1-2, Δ 63 warn us against it. πολύχανδρος ἰππov : 264n.

308

For the terminology cf. hAp.518-9 σῆβι .. Μοῦσαι / ἐν ἐτήθεσσιν ἐθήκε θεὰ .. ὡς δὴν /; χ 47-8 (Phemius) θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν σῆμασ' / παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν. We may be grateful at least that Q. did not go to the ridiculous lengths of Oppian(Hal.4.7f.). πᾶσαν : entire, in all its aspects and ramifications. Hesiod has the power to sing τὰ τ' ἐβόλεμένα πρό τ' εὐόντα (Th.32, cf.38), i.e. everything that the omniscient (B 485) Muses inspire in him. μοι ἐνὶ φρεσίν : cf. ο 486; A.R.4.1673; vi.10. ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θεῆκατ' : 229n. ὡς δὴν : Q. may or may not (cf. above) have read ὡς δὴν in Hes.Th.31 (ὡς δὴν vulg.). ὡς δὴν here, despite πᾶσαν ὡς δὴν in Arat.18, means I think not 'poem' (Vian) but 'power of song', 'art of singing', as at N 730-1 ὥκε θεὸς ὡς δὴν / and elsewhere in Homer (cf. R.J. Cunliffe, A Lexicon to the Homeric Dialect, s.v.4); and at Hes.Th.22 (Muses) καλῶν ἐτίθεσσαν ὡς δὴν /, where the poet is confusing the notion that his encounter with the Muses made him an accomplished poet with the reality of training to be a poet (a different view is taken by Verdenius, op.cit. fn.46, 232). Expert as he now is, Q. of course still needs their help: so does Hesiod, cf. Th.104 and esp.114.

309

Homer's πρὶν φωῖν ὑπὸ κροτάφοισιν ἰούλασ' / ἐνδῆσαι πυκνά τε γένυσ

εὐανθεῖ" λαχρή (λ 319-20) gave rise to a host of imitations. For the four basic components of Q.'s line, $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\lambda\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$, $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota(\acute{\alpha})$ sim., $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ —cf.:—
 (i) GVI 653.6(iip); (i)(ii) id. 780.5-6(iip); (i)(iii) id. 1057.3(iiip); (iii) A.Th. 534, GVI 1997.9(iiip), [Orph.] A 228, Nonn. 3.414, 10.180; (iv) GVI 648.7 (iip). Other parallels (particularly for (iv)) in Headlam on Hdas. 1.52, Gow on Theoc. 15.84f., Allen-Halliday, Addenda to hAphr. 228. Q. was in his (late?) teens (cf. Fitton in Glotta 53, 1975, 229) when he was filled with an urge to write verse (this poem?); or at least he says he was: cf. Call. $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\ \mu\omicron\iota$ $\lambda\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$ codd. Perhaps $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$ (Hermann; and so Vian*). Koechly's $\mu\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\tau'$ I find hard to comprehend. $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$: this occurs as a variant in Homer at (a) Γ 35 (: $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$), where according to some authorities (cf. schol., with Erbse ad loc.) Aristarchus read $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$, according to others $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$. For an attempt to resolve the conflicting testimonies see van der Valk, Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 78f.; La Roche, 332f., suggests that Aristarchus may have left the question open with a $\delta\iota\chi\omega\varsigma$. $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$ was explained as neut. plur. or dual, cf. Wackernagel 60. (b) χ 491 (\sim \cup 353; : $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}$), ascribed by Didymus to Aristarchus. Its presence in Q. may however have nothing to do with Homeric disputes. $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$ is found in IME 168.26 (i-iii); Peisand. GDK Suppl. 6.18.1 ($\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ Heitsch with Keydell): $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\alpha$ would serve as an obvious model.

310

$\xi\mu\upsilon\rho\nu\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\nu\ \delta\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\beta\iota$: perhaps $\delta\alpha\pi.$ has a touch of the grandiose (cf. Barrett on E. Hipp. 230), but more likely it denotes simply 'land', cf. iv. 153 $\iota\theta\eta\beta\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\nu\ \delta\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\iota\beta\iota$, Anon. AP 7.90.1 etc.; and Maguinness, CQ n.s. 8, 1958, 17 on $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$. $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\eta\lambda\alpha$: the sheep are 'renowned', highly thought of, i.e. of outstanding quality, like the Cyclops' sheep (ε 308 $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\eta\lambda\alpha$ /); cf. v. 621 $\beta\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \dots\ \epsilon\rho\iota\kappa\upsilon\delta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha$ / (for sacrifice). For the whole expression cf. PLille (292n.) v. 241 $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \mu\eta\lambda\alpha\ \nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$.

311

An adaptation of the Homeric $\tau\acute{o}\beta\beta\omicron\nu\ \lambda\pi\omicron\ \pi\tau\acute{o}\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\beta\omicron\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu\epsilon\ \beta\omicron\eta\acute{\gamma}\alpha\varsigma$ (ε 294, cf. ε 400al.); 'bland imitation' (M.N. Nagler, Spontaneity and Tradition,

1974, 34.11) is too kind. τῖς τόβον : cf. x.25 / τῖς τόβος ; E 136 τῖς τόβον, A.R. 2.342-3 τῖς τόβον ... / ὀββον ... ἀπώδεν : 293n. βοόωντος ἀκούσαι : similar clausulae in Nonn. 11.319, 454; [Apolin.] 4.7, 65.37, 142.3.

312

For the structure of Z 88 / νηὸν Ἀθηναίης .. ἐν πόλει ἄκρη /, id. 297. Ἀρτέμιδος ἀεὶ νηὸν = Nic. HE 2761 (νᾶν). Ἐλευθερίω [-ίου West] : see Vian, tome i, xn.1. Prospects of certain identification seem remote.

ἐνὶ κήπῳ : cf. Θ 306; Nonn. 12.247 (s.v.l. : ἀπὸ -ην Keydell, Gnomon 45, 1973, 24, alii alia), id. 45.155 ὡς ἐνὶ κ. / = [Orph.] L.234.

313

ᾶτε λίην : cf. ψ 175, and for λίην in topographical description v 243 / οὐδὲ λίην λυπρή, ο 405. λίην χθαμαλῶ : [Apolin.] 37.15 ± υ λίην χθαμαλός. ὑψόθι πολλῶ : 'big, high up' is not particularly elegant; cf. Arat. 87 ὑψόθι πολλός /.

314

πρώτος μὲν = Arat. 1055; iv. 502 (list of warriors). For the element 'first' at the head of a catalogue see Häussler A&A 19, 1973, 120.16; for μὲν in the Muses' 'reply', West on Hes. Th. 116. κατεβρίνεν ... κητέεντα : Q. is if nothing else a passable metrician. This miserable verse, which possesses a highly unusual spondaic distribution (La Roche, op.cit. on 140 supr., 42⁸ 7) and which infringes the Gerhard-Wernicke Law, seems to have been thrown together from λ 523 εἰς ἵππον κατεβρίνομεν and Z 288a1. εἰς θάλαμον κατεβρίβετο κητέεντα / (cf. Vian, Rech. 159). Still, better poets than Q. can sometimes misbehave—a fact that Arthur Platt recognised often enough but refused to recognise here (JPh 31, 1910, 297). κητέεντα : as a rule Q. avoids hard Homeric words ('...which nobody in historical times understood', Page 160.24): maybe this is a traditional epithet. It means, I think, 'vast' (cf. on μεγακήτης in 151, and orac. in AppAnth. 264.51, p. 521); according to Borthwick, JHS 87, 1967, 19 it suggests the belly of a sea-monster—the πολυχανδέα (~ 307 supr.) νηδύν of Opp. Hal. 5.331.

315

νῖος Ἀχιλλεύς : 9x in Q. (plus accus.vii.686), and Triph.52. Homer has Ἀχιλλεύς ... νῖος / (γ 189, = Il.Parv. F19.1) and /νῖος Ἀγαμέμνων (Π 571; cf. x.148, xiv.436). Neoptolemos is of course an essential member. He is πρῶτος also in Triph.153, and attention is focused upon his conduct in the Horse at λ 523f. Cf. Ervin, Arch.Delt. 18², 1963, 54f. εὖν ... Μενέλαος : cf. κ 436 εὖν δ' ὅθ' ἄρα εὖν εἴπετ' Ὀδυσσεύς / ὅς κ' ἀστερόν is well established in archaic epic: [Hes.] F 197.3 (Κάτωρ τε καὶ) ὅς κ' Πολυδευκής; K 536 (Ὀδυσσεύς τε καὶ) ὅς κ' Διομήδης /, Θ 532a1. ὅς κ' Διομήδης / (~ vii.483 Ὀδυσσεύς τε καὶ ὁ δὲ θεὸς Δ. /); cf. also Theoc. 17.26, 22.140; iv.311; related types in Svenssonⁿ 59, 68, 79-80, 103. δ' ὅς : δ' ἑ^c is an expected variant: cf. B 278; K 363; Π 25 (ὅς om. Aristoph.); Theoc. 22.140; H^c at vii.483; ctr.v.1. contra metrum at M 366.

315-6

Menelaus is a regular inmate; brother Agamemnon stayed away (339). For the sequence Menelaus-Odysseus-Diomedes cf. Hyg. 108, and (1-3-2) δ 280; for Odysseus-Sthenelus Virg. A. 2.261(2-1); for Sthenelus-Diomedes cf. Kullmann 89.

316

Σθένελος ... varies the pattern of Θ 114 Σθένελος τε καὶ Εὐρυμέδων 2 γαπήνωρ / . τε ... Διομήδης : so γ 232 - ὅς τε καὶ λντ, Γανυμήδης / , γ 414 (... Θρασύμηδης /), θ 119. In catalogues also τε καὶ λντίθεν υ υ - x (A 264a1., cf. [Hes.] F8). λντίθεος : again of Diom. in vii.244, ix.423, xi.339; not Homeric, cf. on 288.

317

βῆ : cf. 324 below. The patterns 'sing.verb x and y' and 'x sing.vb. and y' are common in archaic epic, particularly in formal catalogues: La Roche, HU 2.239f. Ἀντικλός : see δ 285f. ~ Il.Parv. F 10, [Ov.] Ib. 567f., Triph. 178, 476f. No more details from Q. about this figure of doubtful renown: cf. Severys, op.cit. on 21-65 supr., 352f.; H. Erbse, Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee, Berlin 1972, 96.57. Μενεσθεν : 306-335(B)n. On this character cf. Page, 174; Dihle, op.cit. on 104 supr., 31.

318

ὄν δὲ Θόας :cf. H₁₆₈=xi.90 /ὄν δὲ Θόας (... καί). For this duo cf. iv.503... τε Θόας τε καὶ ἰβόθεος Πολυποίτης /; Thoas: Austin on Virg. A. 2.262.

ἐρίθυμος : 'plein d'ardeur' (cf. Follet 179) rather than 'magnanime' (Vian*, who regards ἐρίθυμος as a synonym of μεγθύμος, the choice between the two being determined by the metre). The word is quite common in Q.; sometimes in repeated combinations (/Πηλείδης -ος 3x; Ἀργείων -ων /2x; Ἀλκείας [s] -ο[s] /2x), in a list of names i.532, ii.364, vi.316, 520, 539. Elsewhere only [Orph.] F270.3; it may be that the word originated in Orphic literature, which is rich in ἐρι- formations (James, op.cit. on 364, p.93) — but what ones among them are 'new' we are hardly in a position to say.

ἰδέ is not especially common in archaic epic and is rather rare thereafter (cf. Ruijgh 55f., who however does not take into account the Hesiodic fragments). Q. uses it 10x to link proper names, and so ἰ626, Hes. Th. 18, F150.15, 291.3 (v.l.), Scut. 185; place-names: B₅₁₁, 697, Z₄.

319

τε ... Θρακυμήδης =vi.540, cf. iv.503 cited in previous note. Q. uses ἰβόθεος here for variety (ctr. γ 414 τε καὶ ἰνείθεος Θρακυμήδης /, and supr. 316). Homer has only ἰβόθεος φῶς (cf. A. Hoekstra, Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes, Amsterdam 1965, 22f.), but the digamma is ignored as early as [Hes.] F 22.4 Ἀγῆνο[ρ]ος ἰβόθεοιο / (cf. Φ 595 Ἀγῆνορος ἰνείθεοιο /).

320

Il. Lat. 208 Idomeneus et Meriones, Cretaeus uterque ~ 241 Amphimachus Nastesque, insignis uterque. Μηριόνης τε καὶ Ἰδομενεύς :cf. N₅₀₀ / Ἀλκείας τε καὶ Ἰδομενεύς ; N₃₀₄¹ - M. τε καὶ Ἰ. ; B₆₅₀₋₁ ~ vi.539-40. For Idomeneus, an important figure in this poem, see Vian, Notice to v, p. 10.1, with Huhn/Bethe, Hermes 52, 1917, 618f. His reappearance at xiii.212 puts him in the minority of recurrent warriors (also Neoptolemos, Menelaus, Odysseus, Diomedes, Ajax, Theseids, Amphilochus(?), Meges, Epeius). ἰρίσεικέτω ἄμφω : structurally akin to Π₁₄₈ Ὀυκαλέων τε καὶ Ἀντήνωρ, πεπνυμένω ἄμφω,

cf. H276, (1689), ε 65. Similarly ii.228-9 $\Theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\eta\nu$, / $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\gamma\acute{\omega}\tau\omega$ (Nov. Met. 8.373 / ambo conspicui), cf. E 152-3 and Σ 516-7. Less stylised is x.118-9.

321

δὺν δ' ἄρ' ...: cf. γ400 / $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \delta'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho'\ \epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\eta\nu\ \Pi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\acute{\iota}\tau\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \dots$
εὐμμελῆς: in Il. this epithet is confined to Priam and the son(s) of Priam (cf. Page, 240f.), but its scope is widened in γ400 and in the Hesiod^o. Q. employs it extensively (particularly of Agamemnon, 339n.), but there are no known borrowings from archaic verse. Ποδελείριος: ctr. Virg. A. 2.263, his brother Machaon, killed off in Q. vi. 391f.

322

Τεύκρος ... καί: cf. Ω257 $\mu\acute{\eta}\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\rho\omega\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\pi\pi\iota\omicron\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\eta\nu$, λ308; [Hes.] F 26.29-30 $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ /\ \tau\omicron\zeta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \eta\delta'$ (καὶ Lobel) "Ιφίτας ὅςος Ἄρηος. -ος καὶ Ἰάλλμενος = B 512. An insignificant figure in Il. (cf. Page 136) and only here in Q. He must have been present in Q.'s source, see on 306-335(B). ὀβριμόθυμος: Hes. Th. 140, Panyas. F16.4 Kinkel, then 22x in imperial verse outside Q. (9 of these in [Orph.] H.). Q. works this word mercilessly. It occurs in a list of names in Hes. Th. supr., and i. 178 ~ v. 31, i. 377, iii. 214; [Orph.] H. pr. 10. The pattern N(ame)E(pithet) / here recalls Hes.: cf. Gr. Naz. 1576. 326 $\text{Νεμέββιος} - \omicron\varsigma$ /. More commonly in Q.: -(a) / NE: / $\text{Αἰῶς} (\delta') - \omicron\varsigma$ [cf. Christod. 271] 5x; / Ἀντίφος 1x; / Μέμνων 3x; / $\text{Φηρέης} (\tau') 2x$: cf. Diosc. GDK 42.23.23 / $\text{Ἰδᾶκ} - \omicron\varsigma$; [Orph.] H. pr. 10, and 12.1, 66.1. (b) EN/: $(\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota) - \omicron\varsigma$ Ἀγῆνωρ / 3x: cf. Christod. 209 - $\omicron\varsigma$ ᾽Οἰλέης /.

323

For the absence of connecting particle at the beginning of the line, common in catalogues, see West on Hes. Th. 245. Ἀμφίμαχος corr.: see introd. n., and for his return from the dead Vian, Notice, 85.7; Kullmann 98. μενεπτόλεμος [cf. ὅςος Ἄρης in B 745a1.] τε Λεοντεύς: cf. N 693 $\text{Μέδων τε μεν. τε Ποδορκῆς}$ /, and viii. 293, ix. 335, xiii. 496. Similar patterns in Triph. 176 $\text{Ἰγυθός τε Λ.} /$; vii. 484 $\text{δῖος} \dots$

324

For the structure see on 317.

325-6

Triph. more naturally brings Demophoon and Acamas together: Δ. τ' Ἀ. τε
δύω Θηβήϊα τέκνα(177).

325

κρατερός τ' Ἀγαπήνωρ :as(e.g.) Ε 385 Ἄτρε κρατερός τ' ἐφιάλτης /, Γ 179;
A.R.4.1496; Anon.ep.GDK 32Ar6; cf.i.229, xi.340.

326

τε Μέγης τε ...:cf. N 692 /Φυλῆϊδης τε Μέγης (Ar.vulg.: Μέγης τ'
Zen.,cf.Ariston. K 175); K 175 Φυλῆϊς υἱόν /, x.138 Μέγης Φυλῆϊς υἱός /.
τε Μέγης τε also Triph.180. κραταίου Φυλῆϊς υἱός :like vii.419, x.350,
xiii.198 κραταίου Τυδεΐς υἱός /, suggested perhaps by Homer's υἱὲ κραταίῳ /
(N 345 o 242=vi.502, 516).

327

Pauw, disturbed by the fact that Q.'s elaborate fanfare is scarcely matched
by a great deal of effort on the part of the Muses, suggested a lacuna
after 327. One does not have to be a Q. to allow a catalogue to fizzle out:
cf.e.g. B 649 /ἄλλαι θ' αἶ ... , Σ 49 /ἄλλαι θ' αἶ ...; F.Krafft, Vergleich
ende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod(Hypomnem.6), Göttingen 1963, 147. There
is more ceremony about unwillingness to indulge in long lists at vi.619f.;
ix.195f.('what man could tell of...', a pose more often assumed by Roman
than Greek epic poets). ἄλλαι θ' αἶ :xiv.95(.. ὄϊοι)+3; once only in
archaic epic, Hes.Th.147, but common later: A.R.4.305, [Theoc.] 25.129, Ep.Adepp.
CA 2.14, Or.Sib.14.195, Man.2.376, 3.323, D.P.33, Opp.Hal.1.102+4, Gr.Naz.623.574
+5. ὄϊοι ... ἄριστοι :cf. P 377 /ὄϊοι ἄριστοι ἔειπεν , Λ 825=Π 23;
ἔειπεν ἔξοχ' ἄριστοι /= δ 629, φ 187, χ 244.

327-8

κατέβαινον χάνδανεν :Λ 191-2 [supr.314n.] κατεβήκετο κεχάνθει /;
for ὄϊοις χ. cf. Λ 462 ~ vii.421.

328

εὐξοός :224n. ἐντὸς ἐέρπειν :after B 845 /ὄϊοις ... ἐντὸς ἐέρπει /, al.,

of.iii.622,xiv.167. There may be a vague recollection of Ν706 οἷον ἐΰξοον
 λυφὶς ἐέρπει /.

329

ἐν δέ σφιν πύματος :so [Orph.] A.911(-τω). / ἐν δέ σφιν also K435,
 A.R.1.1284, [Orph.] L.720,x.73 etc. δῖος ἑπειός :151n. He is last named
 in Virg.A.2.264...et ipse doli fabricator Epeos,cf.Triph.182-3 ἑτατος αὐτε /
 τέχνης ἀγλαόμητις ἐὼς ἐπέβαινεν ἑπειός :but ctr.Triph.200f. with Q.332-4.

330

ὅς ... ἐΐτευξεν :iv.325 /ὅς τε καὶ ἵππον ἐΐτευξε . For /ὅς ῥα καί cf.
 [Hes.] F23(a)29,Il.Pers.F5.7,AP 14.148.7(=OrGr.167 Hendess). ἐπίστατο
 ...θυμῷ :cf. δ730 ἐπιτάμεναι .. θυμῷ/. ῥ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ :not in Homer,
 (ῥ' θυμῷ I 598, ε 126),but cf. Υ195al. ὥς ἐνὶ θ. /, α 320(ῥῷ δ').

331

A recasting of the difficult λ525(Odysseus and the Horse) ἡμὲν ἀνακλίνεαι
 πυκινὸν λόχον ἥδ' ἐπιθεῖναι (ath.Aristarchus;details in G.M.Bolling,The
External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer,Oxford 1925,211f.).

ἀνω ἵξαι :comparable 'formae monstrosae' (Koechly)in V.Schmidt,Sprachliche
Untersuchungen zu Herondas,Berlin 1968,83.39. πτύχας : 'battants d'une
 porte' Vian,q.v.

332

τοῦνεκα δῆ' :v.363;also Γ405;Arat.645;Or.Sib.1.83,3.330;GVI 261.5(Lycia,
 i-ii);EpGr.878.11 Kaibel(Athens,iip);Theon(?)AppAnth.146.6,p.315;[Apolin.]
 pr.105 and 134.30;Anon.AP 9.194.2. /ἀνεκα δῆ' is much commoner. βῆ
δέντατος :cf. Τ51 α 286 δέντατος ἤλθεν.

332-3

εἴρυε ... / κλίμακας :no doubt nautical terminology(see on 423f.):[Orph.]
 A.529 / κλίμακα νηὶς ἔβω ἐρύει (χ 187 ἐρύειν τε μιν εἴβω/). The κλίμακες
 are dealt with at greater length(and with some naïveté)in xiii.51f.,Triph.
 90f. Virgil in contrast talks of a rope,cf.Austin on A.2.262,Vian on xiii.
 53(p.224).

333

αὐτῷ :he in his turn took up position,after seeing that all was in order. No

need for $\epsilon\upsilon$ (Rhodomann). $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\beta\alpha\varsigma$ Rhodomann, cf. 331: $\epsilon\pi\iota\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\varsigma$ codd.
Follet(178f.)unconvincingly suggests $\epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\rho\delta\alpha\varsigma$.

334

$\lambda\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$... $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$:cf. $\epsilon 194\text{al.}$ / $\lambda\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\rho$... ($\xi 260$ $\rho 429$ $\pi\alpha\rho$ $\gamma\eta\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ =vii.6); $\Sigma 100$ / η δ' $\lambda\rho\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\rho$ $\Delta\iota$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$. For the $\kappa\lambda\eta\iota\varsigma$ see Triph. 539.

334-5

$\tau\omicron\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$...:after $\text{H} 427\text{al.}$ $\sigma\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\iota\omega\pi\eta\eta$ /;cf. the formulaic [$\eta 153\text{f.}$ $\kappa\alpha\tau'$ $\lambda\rho'$ $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau'$... / $\pi\alpha\rho$ $\pi\upsilon\rho\iota$] $\sigma\varsigma$ δ' $\lambda\rho\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\eta\upsilon$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\iota\omega\pi\eta\eta$ / . $\epsilon\iota\omega\pi\eta\eta$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu$ perhaps contains an active suggestion that this Horse will not house any vociferous individuals.

335

$\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu$: $\gamma 134$, Nonn. 17.335. $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\beta\eta\gamma\upsilon\varsigma$:cf. the use of $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\upsilon$; inter in Roman verse(e.g. Virg. A. 1.218, Ov. Met. 10.482, Stat. Silv. 5.3.218); and vii. 543 $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\beta\eta\gamma\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu$ $\kappa\rho\upsilon\epsilon\rho\omega\upsilon$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\iota\omicron$, Gr. Naz. 672.70-1 $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\beta\eta\gamma\upsilon\varsigma$ $\iota\omega\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\lambda\rho\gamma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu$ $\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$ / $\epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\eta\omega\varsigma$, Nonn. 34.238-9 $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\beta\eta$ / ... $\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$.. $\omicron\lambda\epsilon\theta\rho\omicron\nu$ / .

336-352

The main Greek force retires to Tenedos.

336

$\sigma\varsigma$ δ' $\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$:cf. 235, Triph. 139, and the summaries of Il. Pers. 231f., [Apollod.] 5.14. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\epsilon\lambda$ $\pi\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\nu$:168n.

337

$\lambda\varsigma$ $\kappa\lambda\iota\beta\iota\alpha\varsigma$:see on 29-31. Virg. (A. 2.27f., cf. Hyg. 108) brushes aside the strong tradition that the Greeks fired their own camp prior to departure($\theta 501$; Il. Parv. 231 ~ [Apollod.] 5.14-15; D. Chr. Or. 11.128; Dictys 5.12; Triph. 140, 215; cf. Tz. Posth. 678, id. on Lyc. 344, 346) in order to permit his Trojans to browse without the discomfort of smoke(ctr. Q. 354; Triph. 230f.) and desolation. Q. might have been better to do the same, for the camp(or a portion of it) rises from the ashes in xiv. 149f. (suggested by the $\epsilon\kappa\eta\gamma\eta$ as centre of action in tragic

340

ἐνδοθεν ἵππον :264n.

341

ἐν νηέσσι μένοντες :cf. iv.92 ἐν νηέσσι μένεν, and xiv.524 ἐν νηέσσι
 περόντες /(after B 175). μένοντε (Lasc.²) would cut down the amount of
 terminal rhyme(—(τ)εσ 341-4), but Q. is not averse to that.

342

ἀλλοις δημαίνωσιν :for ἀλλοις Vian compares 235supr. But Koechly's λαοῖς
 (cf. the variants at N 710, X 205) is very tempting: P 250-1 δημαίνουσιν ../
 λαοῖς, 'Simon.' EpGr. 215 Page(=GVI 1187) /δημαίνε λαοῖς . ἐπεὶ πολὺ
λῶσιν :299n.

343

ἐργῶ ἐποίχονται :cf. vi.5 /ἀλλοι δ' ἀλλοίοισιν ἐπώχοντ' ;but Z 492al.
 (sim. Mimn. IEG 14.10-11) /ἐργῶν ἐποίχεσθαι . Perhaps the dative is due to
 a mistaken interpretation of α 143 αὐτοῖσιν ..ἐπώχετο οὐνοχοεύων/, or
 vulg. M 340 πάσαις .. ἐπώχετο, or a hazy recollection of [Theoc.] 25.32
 (γύαι and ἀλῶαί) /ἀς ἡμεῖς ἐργοῖσιν ἐποιχόμεθα. ὁπότε εὐδορώσιν
ἀνάκτες draws on § 60 (used by Maumach. GDK 29.50) and p 320-1. ἀνάκτας
 codd. : maybe Q. got the scribes he deserved, though his audience presumably
 savoured this kind of vapid generalisation, cf. on ³ 388.

344

invites comparison with E 94 οὐδ' ἄρα μιν μίμνον πολέες περ εὐόντες/.

τοῦνέκ' ἄρ' :6x in Q.; also A 96, v 194; Hes. Op. 49; Or. Sib. 3.96, 8.483.

ἐκτοθι μίμνον :284n.

345f.

A short description of arrival and landing procedures based on various scenes
 in Homer, who treats the motif with differing degrees of elaboration, cf. Arend
 79f. with Taf. 5 Schem. 9. 345: the journey is normally disposed of quickly,
 Arend 86(θῶν : cf. γ 176 ὤκα); ἀφίκοντο : cf. ἴκοντο A 484 π 324al. —
 346: εὐνῶς κτλ. : A 436f. = o 498f. ἐκ δ' εὐνῶς ἔβλον κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήει?
 ἔδησαν / ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτὰ βάνων , cf. v 116 ἐκ νηὸς βάντες and the n. ad loc.
 — 347: ἐβλυμένως : cf. καρπαλίμως in A 435, o 496. — 348: αὐτὸν δέ : cf. A 487.

345

οὐ ... ῥαφίζοντο : likewise Dion. Bass. F16 / οὐ δὲ θούῃ προγέγοντο , cf. x. 256 ῥαφίζοντο θούῃ , v. 453 / ἤ δὲ θούῃ ἔκανε ποτὶ ... , and o 216, 447. / οὐ δὲ θούῃ also Theoc. 22.76 (ν [Orph.] A. 444, 562); Opp. Hal. 3.557+4; iii. 705, xiv. 329, 488. πρὸς ἡϊόνας Τενέδοιο : 131n. Cf. 278. The Greeks' destination is Tenedos in Il. Parv. 232, Il. Pers. 254, and nearly always in later accounts: Virg. A. 2.21f. (est in conspectu Tenedos, no doubt from an ἐῖσι δέ τις prototype) ν Hyg. 108; [Apollod.] 5.14 etc.; Triph. 217; Tz. Posth. 680 cf. id. on Lyc. 930fin. In Lyc. 346f. the armada goes to Tenedos and Calydnae (for the recherche point see the passages in Ebeling s. Καλύδναι), in Dictys 5.12 ad Sigeum secedunt, a version perhaps connected in some way with the story of Sinon's signal from Achilles' tomb there (mentioned id. 5.15).

346

εὐνὰς ... ἐβαλον : cf. ε 137 εὐνὰς βαλέειν ; A. R. 4.1713 / ἐνθ' εὐνὰς ἐβάλλοντο ν Call. (?) F727. κατὰ βένθεος : here only, but κατὰ βένθος 6x in Q. and (e.g.) Σ 38, 49; A. R. 4.966; Procl. H. 3.3. ἐκ δ' ἐβαν αὐτοί : Γ 113, γ 11, δ 785; again in [Orph.] A. 636.

347-8

Similar sequences in vii. 372-3 ἀν' αὐτοὶ ἐβαν τοὶ δ' ἐκτοθι πείματα' ἐ'λυγαν / εὐνὰς θ' , ix. 435-6 / πείματαθ' ὁμῶς εὐνηῖν .. ἀείρεν / ἐκτοθεν ἐγκονέοντες, xiv. 371-2 νηῶν πείματα' ἐ'λυγαν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἡ δὲ καὶ εὐνὰς / ἐβουμένως ἀνείρεν. For πείματα' ἐ'ηγαν / cf. A. R. 4.523 (ν κ 96); for ἡϊόνων A. R. 4.661-2 ἐκ δ' ἄρα νηὸς / πείματα' ἐπ' ἡϊόνων .. βάλον, 903-4 οὐ δ' ἀπὸ νηὸς / ἡ'ῆν πείματα' ἐμελλον ἐπ' ἡϊόνεσσι βαλέσθαι ν Colluth. 228-9 ἐπ' ἡϊόνεσσι βαλόντες / πείματα νηὸς ἐ'ηγαν.

348

παρ' αὐτοῖσι μίμνον : Homer uses αὐτοῖσι with μίμνειν (Σ 245 etc.), and cf. Ψ 163 παρ' αὐτοῖσι μένον , though A. R. (2.528-9) may have read there κατὰ τοῖσι, as does a Ptolemaic papyrus (West PP 180). παρ' αὐτοῖσι (or rather παρ' αὐτοῖσι) again at vi. 440, vii. 437 (both with κεῖτο , cf. κατ' αὐτοῖσι at iii. 376, where Y has -όφι , see Allen on N 42, Ψ 147, 640). μίμνον ἑκηλοῖ : ἑκηλος = 'inactive' (cf. Gow on [Theoc.] 25.100), keeping quiet and doing nothing that

might give the game away. For the clausula cf. A.R. 3.176 $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\theta' \epsilon\kappa\eta\lambda\sigma\iota$ /; with $\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu$ also S.OC1039 ~ A.R. 1.303-4; with $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ O 194-5, [Orph.] F135.5; $\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\eta\lambda - + \mu\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu -$: Opp. Hal. 1.408, 597.

349

$\delta\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \delta\pi\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$: Σ 523-4 $\delta\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\lambda \eta\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron \dots / \delta\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \delta\pi\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon \dots \iota\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron \dots$
 $\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\beta\iota \phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$: so xiv.62 ($\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\nu}\theta\eta$) = A.R. 2.1285; H 7 ($\phi\alpha\nu\eta\tau\eta\nu$);
 orac. in AppAnth. 264.17, p. 520 ($\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$).

350

$\delta\eta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \delta\chi\epsilon\delta\acute{o}\nu$: vii.495 $\delta\eta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \delta\epsilon \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \delta\chi\epsilon\delta\acute{o}\nu$. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\omicron\nu$: only in Q. (8x; $\delta\tau\epsilon \delta'$ ix.116, x.267). Archaic epic offers $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\epsilon /$ (Φ 464), ... $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho /$ (Hes. Th. 830). There is a general resemblance here to A.R. 3.766-7 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon \delta' \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\tau\iota, \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\iota \delta\epsilon \dots$ $\pi\omicron\nu$: 'I suppose'; the poet intervenes (Vian*); cf. on 449.

351

$\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\iota \delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$: for the form cf. v.450 $/ \kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\iota \delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and for the expression Homer's $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma - \sigma\nu \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\theta\omicron\iota /$ (Δ 12al.; -οῖς Theoc. 22.18).

$\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\iota$: so codd. iii.17, xiii.230. For $-\epsilon\iota-$ not $-\iota-$ in Homer see Jacobsohn 99f., Wackernagel 75f.; Ptolemaic papyri give $-\epsilon\iota-$ at Λ 821, κ 51, υ 67 (West, PP 114, 252, 276); for A.R. see Vian, Budé I, p. lxxvi.

$\delta\tau\epsilon \delta'$: cf. Λ 566, 568 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\tau\epsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \delta\tau\epsilon \delta' \dots$; A.R. 3.1022-3; Nic. Ther. 288; iii.432-3, vii.150, ix.239; 350n. $\delta\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\upsilon$: 235n. For $\delta\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ of Troy in Homer cf. Defradas, RPh 29, 1955, 209; Wulfing-v. Martitz, Glotta 38, 1960, 278f. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\upsilon \delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\iota$: cf. xiv.71 $\delta\epsilon\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\upsilon /$; A. Suppl. 680 $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu \delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\xi\omega\nu \sim$ i.196 $\acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma \dots \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$. For xii.351 and i.196 a parallel pattern is afforded by S.OC1319 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\upsilon \delta\eta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\iota\nu \sim$ id. 1533 $\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\acute{\omega}\nu \dots \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu$, cf. Wackernagel 171.

352

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \dots \epsilon\lambda\pi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\beta\iota\nu$: iii.479 $/ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon\lambda\pi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$. Cf. in general μ 311 and later Nonn. 29.323. $\epsilon\pi\eta\acute{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu \text{ } ^\eta\text{H}\rho\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha$: cf. [Orph.] A. 1185 $\epsilon\pi\eta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\nu \text{ } ^\eta\text{H}\rho.$ / \sim χ 197-8 $^\eta\text{H}\rho.$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$; hDem. 51 $\sigma\acute{\iota} \epsilon\pi\eta\acute{\iota}\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon \dots \text{ } ^\eta\text{H}\acute{\omega}\varsigma /$.

The Trojans emerge and pour round the Horse.

Virg.A.2.25f.

nos abiisse rati et vento petiisse Mycenas.
ergo omnis longo solvit se Teucria luctu:
panduntur portae,iuvat ire et Dorica castra
desertosque videre locos litusque relictum:
hic Dolopum manus,hic saevus tendebat Achilles;
classibus hic locus,hic acie certare solebant.
pars stupet innuptae donum exitiale Minervae
et molem mirantur equi.....

This is a scene which those who favour Virgilian influence in Q. are fond of invoking. They are easily satisfied. Of Triph. Heinze remarked(81): 'wenn er Virgil kannte,hat er ihn sicher nicht geliebt'—and this might be applied with even greater force to Q. It would be difficult indeed to imagine how these two passages could be more unlike each other,whether in structure or in content. If it is true to say that V.'s account resembles the situation outlined in [Apollod.] 5.16 ἔρημον αὖ Τρῶες τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων στρατοπέδον θεωροῦμενοι καὶ νομίζαντες αὐτοὺς πεφενγέναι (cf.also Il.Parv. 233f.),his style is far removed from that of a 'guidebook',whereas Q. tells his story in the manner of a crude summarizer(cf.'they spotted...they spotted...they spotted' 353,358,360). He does,to be sure,share as many as three details with V.,but details which are traditional:(i)356,delight: Petr.17; [Apollod.] 5.16;Dictys 5.11;Triph.243f. (ii)358-9,the Trojans pour around the Horse:Triph.248f.,with a simile now known to be derived from Stesich.Il.Pers.(SLG 88ii.19f.;pap.s.ii-iii). (iii)359,the Horse is enormous. Its size is of course often referred to(e.g.Virg.A.2.15,150 [where see Austin],185~ Sen.Ag.627a,Hyg,108;Triph.58,104)and Q. is working with traditional phraseology:Dio Chrys.Or.11.123 δ' ... ἵππος ὁ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐρελίσθη,μέγα ἔργον.

Details not found in V.:(a)(i)352,time-reference:cf. [Apollod.] 5.16,

Triph.235f.,Tz.Posth.684. (ii)354, smoke:337n. (b)(i)354-5, 'they no longer saw the ships' must be a traditional feature:cf.,from the Trojan point of view,Petr.11 pulsas mille credidimus rates(Eumolpus throws in the canonical number to show off); 'death-bringing ships' could also be:it is based on B 303f.(~ Cic.Div.2.63, the Greek fleet at Aulis),cf.Enn.Alexandr.17.43f. (fleet arriving at Troy). (ii)357:V. makes his Trojans wide-eyed and innocent, as had Euripides before him(Tr.521f., a remarkable description of ἄτῃ running riot). Q.'s Trojans come armed,because they are still afraid:perhaps a traditional detail,cf.'fear' in Sen.Ag.638,Petr.17-18. Q. seems to be recalling A.R.1.633f., the emergence of the Lemnian women from their city: ἄτ' ... ἴδον δῆϊα τῶχ'εα εὐδαί εἰς λίγυλόν προχέοντο τοῖόν σφιν ἐπὶ δέος ἦωρεῖτο .

A notable Virgilian detail(cf.Petr.15f.,and E.Tr.532;Dictys 5.11; Triph.238), the emergence from the city-gates, finds no place in Q.

353

Τρῶες δ'εἰβενόγησαν :ix.267 / Τρῶας δ'εἰβενόγησεν ;cf.464infr. ἐπ'
ἡρόειν ἑλληπτόντων:131n.

354

καπνὸν .. λ'ἰβόντα :cf.κ 99 / καπνὸν δ' .. δρῶμεν λπὸ χθονὸς λ'ἰβόντα /,
[Orph.] L.486 / καπνὸν ... λναἰβόντα ; κ 58(~ Pall.AP 9.395.3) καπνὸν
λποδρῶσκοντα νοήσαι /. δὶ' ἡέρος : =288 and often thereafter. For
the association of καπνός with λήρ cf.iii.715,x.194;for λ'ἰβόντα iii.
708 δὶ' ἡέρος (v.1. λίθ'έρος) λ'ἰβόντα /(xiii.105 λ'ἰβόντα δὶ' ἀιθ'έρος)
after A.R.2.1033-4 λ'ἰβόντα /... δὶ' ἡέρος ,3.1379 δὶ' ἡέρος λ'ἰβάντα / .

355

σφιν ἐνείκων =v.1. δ 784;cf.Triph.290 6ε νῆες ἐνείκων /. ἐνείκων ...
ὀλεθρον :cf.i.14,x.352. σφ' ἑλλᾶδος :so iii.785 / νῆες .. τᾶς ἡγόν σφ'
ἑλλᾶδος ;cf.A.R.2.1141a1. λινὸν ὀλεθρον :ix.338. I have not come across
this combination outside Q.,who has it 10x(infr.418=6x).

356

ἐπέδραμον λίγυλολίβι :an identical clausula in Opp.Hal.1.246.

357

τεύχε' ἐφείκαμένοι : Ψ 803 / τεύχεα ἐφείκαμένοι. ἔτι... θυμόν : ix.273

δέος ἔμπεχε Τρῶας /; cf. 466n. For γὰρ δέος... cf. P 625, hAp. 447, vi.600, ix.7 etc. In Homer δέος is often said to take hold of you, cf. Gruber 27.

ἔμπεχε θυμόν : cf. ε 295 ἔχε θυμόν / . ἔμπεχε is Vian's correction for ἔμφ—.

Erbse (566f.) argues that ἔμπεχε, offered by codd. in only five places (ix.394, xi.30, 47, 436, xiv.387) is lectio facillior; for ἔμφ— he compares A.R.1.

324 ἔμφεχέτο, B 41 ἔμφεχέτο, Ψ 79 ἔμφεχάνε. The relevance of the last two is hard to discern; in A.R. a papyrus (Π² in Vian) now offers ἔμπεχέτ',

cf. the note of Henrichs in ZPE 1, 1967, 114. ἔμφ— is not impossible, but

it seems better to read the 'epic' form, particularly as in Opp. Hal. 5.512,

the possible model for this hard-worked word in Q., we read τοῖόν μιν

ἔμψχανον ἔμπεχε πένθος /.

358

εὐξοόν : 224n. ἔμφι δ' ἔρ' ἀντὶ : 16x in Q. Cf. Γ 362 (but the reading was

disputed in antiquity), Λ 473v.1., = 447; Opp. Hal. 3.287, 4.440; Nonn. Met. 7.46

(con. Ludwig, right surely), D. 6.84, 10.400, 37.233.

359

θαμβέων ἐταότες : so ii.502 ἐθαμβέων ἐταήναι / . cf. B 320 ἡμεῖς δ'

ἐταότες θαυμάζομεν ὅαν ἐτύχθη, Λ 394. μέλα... ἔργον : 244n. For

μέλα ἔργον of a physical object cf. e.g. H 444 / θηῶντο μέλα ἔργον

(the Achaean wall); Bissinger 201f., 208. ἔργον ἐτύχθη = Δ 470; again in

Gr. Naz. 1286.7; [Apolin.] 79.32, 36.

360-388

Sinon faces the Trojans.

The ground is prepared for the confrontation in 32-45, 238-259. Subsequent mentions: 389f., 418f., xiii.21f., 30f., xiv.107f.

The Sinon and Laocoon episodes in Q. raise the question: did Q. use Virgil?⁵¹ It may be said at once that direct imitation is out of the question, unless Q. had a remarkably stubborn temperament—so stubborn

that, having scanned what V. had to say on the building of the Horse, on Sinon, on Laocoon, on the introduction of the Horse, he promptly forgot or ignored almost every memorable detail and instead contented himself with reflecting, not always with precision, and sometimes in a spirit of blatant contradiction, the underlying structure, preferring to go elsewhere for a large variety of key elements in the saga. Failure to exploit Virgilian details cannot always—indeed cannot very often—be explained by a lust for concision, and it will not do to shake off solid discrepancies by adopting rhetorical poses of the kind found e.g. in Kehmptzow (p. 52): 'quid autem? Nonne licuit Quinto, quae legerat apud Vergilium, examinare et nonnulla mutare? Those who insist that Q. is indebted to V. must content themselves with something far short of an Aeneid; a summary (and a drastically contaminated one), a pictorial representation maybe, a work drained of poetic vitality. If our poem seems remote (how remote, we shall presently see) from V. now, it is as certain as anything can be that if we were able to view V. even to a slight degree in relation to his Greek and Roman forerunners it could be housed, securely and irrevocably, in an alien world.

The following four sections deal with major categories of the Sinon-story. Other details will be dealt with from time to time in their respective places.

§ 1. Sinon's role in the story of the Horse⁵².

(a) He is left behind to give a fire-signal to the Greeks: Il. Pers. 252f. cf. Sud. s. Πυρεϊόν; Lyc. 344f.; Pl. Ba. 937f.; [Apollod.] 5.19; Dictys 5.12; for details see Austin on Virg. A. 2.256. One may note that Q.'s version of the signal (xiii. 23f., Sinon fearfully sends up a flare inside the city) cannot be paralleled with any certainty: Il. Parv. is not precise; nor is Dictys, pace Austin loc. cit.

(b) Sinon confronts the Trojans before the Horse is admitted: so Q., cf. Virg. A. 2.57f. (~ Petr. 13f., [Hyg. 108], Sid. Carm. 9.126f.); Triph. 258f., sim. Palaeph. 16; Tz. Posth. 680f.⁵³ Q. is alone in making Sinon give no reason why the Trojans should admit the Horse: see § 2.

§ 2. The character of Sinon.

(a) 'Bei Virgil liegt alles Gewicht auf der meineidigen Listigkeit des Sinon, bei Quintus auf seiner Festigkeit, die ihn trotz aller Qualen auf seiner Aussage beharren lässt', Heinze 66. Q.'s Sinon does not take the trouble to give the Trojans reasons for admitting the Horse (see § 1(b)). That is not his function. The question of admission poses no problem: Odysseus automatically assumes that the Trojans will admit it (40f.) and house it in their own acropolis (236f.), provided that Sinon does not weaken. What Sinon must do is go on maintaining (39)⁵⁴, whatever torture might be imposed, that the Horse was built in honour of Pallas (37f.), and this he does, with the flourish that he himself was saved by the Horse from the murderous Greeks (384f.). Odysseus does not want an orator but a brave hero (32f. ~ 238cf. 253f.), a martyr if need be (cf. 251f.), who will steel himself to any torture (34f. ~ 239, cf. 249f., 365f.). The keynote of the scene is endurance, note esp. 388, a 'comment' from the poet, and xiv. 107f., where the Greeks marvel at Sinon's endurance in the face of a savage foe. Sinon's deceitfulness is mentioned of course (364, 374, 387, cf. 390), but the sequence of 387f. shows clearly and unequivocally how submerged the motif is: ctr., e.g., Virg. A. 2. 152f.⁵⁵

(b) 'Sinon the beggar'. It has often been noted⁵⁶ (see Euph. CA 69) that the description of Sinon in Il. Pers. 253 $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\nu\ \epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\omega\varsigma\ \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\iota\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is reminiscent of the $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha$ of Odysseus recounted in § 243f. (cf. also Il. Parv. 224f.). What one would expect in an epic, as opposed to a tragic ~ Virgilian account of Sinon is a reflection of this 'doublet' aspect. Sinon should look and behave like a beggared Odysseus. And so he does.

In Od. § Odysseus, self-mutilated (cf. Triph.; Tz. on Lyc. 344) penetrated Troy in disguise. He is cited by Helen as an example of endurance (see § 2 (a)): 242 $\lambda\lambda'\ \alpha\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\tau\lambda\eta\ \kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\eta\eta\rho\ \dots$ ⁵⁷ Helen's story has affinities with that of Q. (§ 242 $\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \lambda\eta\eta\rho\ \sim\ 388$; § 251 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\iota\nu\ \lambda\eta\eta\rho\omega\tau\omega\nu\ \sim\ 361$; § 251 $\kappa\epsilon\rho\delta\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\ \sim\ 387$) and of Triph. (§ 244 ~ 219cf. 275, 276 ~ Q. v. 279; § 253cf. 305). Triph.'s version of Sinon's escapade bears marked resemblances to Lycophron's account of the enduring

(cf. 775, 777) Odysseus' πτωχία (where Odysseus deceived king Priam, 785; Triph. 219 ~ 783; Triph. 227 etc. ~ 785; Triph. 260 ~ 783). The concept of ὁδυσσεύς ἀντόμολος in this connexion (see Robert 1232) is reflected in Sinon ἀντόμολος at Palaeph. 16.

Further: Q.'s Sinon bears the stamp of the Odyssean hero's assumed role of beggar when he returns home to tell various fictitious tales prior to slaughtering the suitors: see the notes on 41, 365-6, 367 (note portions of Od. in which this mode of punishment is mentioned), 371, 374 [6 51, φ 274], and add 368 ~ 622, xiii. 26 ~ τ 391. There are occasional traces of the beggar Odysseus in Triph. too, but they are less marked.

In the Greek, if not the Roman, tradition, Odysseus and Sinon are to all intents and purposes beggars in disguise, and can be thought of as identical twins: cf. xiv. 110f. with Christod. 173f. It is from this pool that both Q. and Triph. are fishing—only they catch rather different fish.

§ 3. Story-lines.

(a) The patterning of Sinon's confrontation with the Trojans is reminiscent of vi. 116f., the arrival of Eurypylus: cf. 116 ~ 353; 124, 131 ~ 358f.; 144f. ~ 421f.; 148f. ~ 361, 420; 184 ~ 248. The basic story-line is akin to that of K 194f.:—a spy must be sent into the Trojan camp; a council is convened (195f.); a courageous man is required (204f.) whose κλέος would reach heaven (213f.); he need not be of high social rank (237f.); Diomedes is joined by Odysseus for the μέγα ἔργον (282). Similarly K 299f.:—Hector asks for a Trojan volunteer (303 τίς κεν μοι τόδε ἔργον σποχόμενος τελέσειε ...); he would win κῆδος (307); a silence (313f.), and Dolon volunteers.

(b) Q.'s Sinon is an epic type. The tragic background to Sinon's dazzling tour de force in V. is self-evident, even if his commentators generally give it no more than a passing glance. It is precisely the total absence of tragic texture in Q. that makes any confrontation with V.'s Sinon meaningless.

(i) The circumstances of Sinon's capture. V.'s Sinon is brought onto the scene by shepherds: 57f. ecce (: καὶ μὴν) ... magno ... clamore, a detail which must go back ultimately to Sophocles. Trojan shepherds figure in the

world of Il. (Δ 455) and are prominent in tragedy: in E. Alexandr. (Hypothesis, Coles 12) shepherds bring Paris bound before Priam; they operate an efficient messenger-service: cf. S. $\Pi\omicron\mu\eta\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$; Rhesus 264f. In Accius' Deiphobus (F3) < a messenger > reports: nos continuo ferrum eripimus, manibus manicas [\sim manicas A.2, 146] neximus, nos presumably being helpers enlisted by the solitary fishermen (for the situation cf. E. IT 264f.) who detected Sinon, if, as seems likely, F2 refers to this circumstance.

(ii) Sinon's complaints against Odysseus. It seems highly improbable that the statement in Deiphobus F4 ab infando homine, gnato Laerta, Ithacensi exsule, / qui neque amico amicus umquam gravis neque hosti hostis fuit could have come from anyone but a Greek⁵⁸, and that the speaker is Sinon is suggested both by the language (cf. infando A.2, 84, 132; Ithac[us] 104, 122, 128) and by the presence of the theme of friendship (cf. A.2, 86, 9³, 147f.; Triph. 286f.; and E. Ph. as paraphrased by Dio Chrys. Or. 59.6f.⁵⁹ The accusations of Odysseus at A.2, 97f. could owe something to the enigmatic Deiph. F5⁶⁰.

(iii) ?? Sinon's appeal to Priam (A.2, 141f. cf. Triph. 262f.). The fragment of Livius Andronicus' Equos Troianos: da mihi hasce opes, / quas peto, quas precor, / porrige, opitula looks to me like an appeal from Sinon⁶¹; possibly it is an appeal from Cassandra to Apollo (cf. Emm. Trag. 17.42, cives ferte opem), but it would seem rather overdrawn, even for such an excitable lady.

(iv) Calchas-Odysseus: see § 4(a)(ii).

(v) Narrative structure. The pauses in Sinon's four speeches are occupied with questioning first from the Trojans as a group (74f., 105f.) and finally from Priam himself (147f.). The layout of Sinon's exposition has been well compared⁶² to that of a messenger-speech in tragedy, where a long exposition may be interrupted by questions either from a chorus or an individual (cf., for example, A. Ag. 503f.). One may note that Sinon's yarn is heralded by a declaration to the effect that he will 'tell the whole truth', just as in S. El. 679f. the paedagogus prefaces his fictions with $\tau\omicron\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \phi\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega$ in reply to Clytemnestra's request for 'the truth'. The speech of 108f. in particular has a distinctly Greek feel to it. —

V. will have been indebted to the tragedy of his own culture, but the Sinon-episode scarcely conceals the breath of Hellas. His account is, naturally, pro-Trojan⁶³, I suspect that this attitude was already at work in Sophocles, for any tragedy involving Sinon will ultimately be a tragedy for Troy and not for him: we are all familiar with the picture of a pall of doom enveloping an innocent Priam and his people, who are going to pay dearly for the $\lambda\tau\eta$ of a single individual. We are witnessing in V., I believe, a direct reflection of one of the deception scenes which Sophocles deploys with such unclouded brilliance⁶⁴.

(c) Triph.'s Sinon is a compromise: he is an epic beggar, willingly mutilated before facing the Trojans (see § 2(b)) and an orator—of sorts (see § 4(b)). It seems to me idle to speculate on the precise source(s) of the mutilation theme. [I find Ter Vrugt-Lentz's contribution (op. cit. in fn. 56, 168f.) to the origins of Sinon's beating-up in Q. muddled and inconsistent: what is the connecting link between (i) Zopyrus (ii) Soph.'s Sinon (iii) Q.'s Sinon? The injuries of (i) [cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2.691f.] and (iii) are incurred in different circumstances, and did Sophocles need Herodotus to teach him about barbaric torture?]

§ 4. Sinon's lies.

(a) The fictions of Q. 375-386, curt and barren of solid detail, led Heinze (p. 67) to maintain, with less than his usual acumen, that Q. is giving the reader all the information at his disposal; Keydell (1931, 75) on the other hand argues that he is not telling us everything by any means; that, in fact, his speech is an inadequate summary of Sinon's utterances in A. 2—so inadequate, that it is unintelligible without reference to V. The similarities are undeniable; but they are no more than superficial.

(i) 375-6: saepe fugam Danai^{Troia} cupiere relictā/moliri et longo fessi discedere bello. Keydell's observation (280) that fugam finds an analogue in $\phi\epsilon\beta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ and longo... bello in $\mu\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon \dots \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\upsilon$ commands instant assent. But—V.'s Sinon makes much of the point: the Greeks eagerly desired to return home on many an occasion, until at long last an opportunity was thrown their

way. Q.'s Sinon speaks quite differently: the Greeks have taken to flight, he declares, roundly and obviously⁶⁵: 'flight' is mentioned by [Apollod.] 5.16; Triph. 212⁶⁶, 237, 273, 299; Tz. Lyc. 340. When Triph.'s Sinon refers to it he does not even bother to offer a motive. The theme of war-weariness ~ flight is developed by Agamemnon in B 134f.

(ii) 377-8 Calchas, 379f. Odysseus. The circumstances surrounding the alleged activities of this duo do not properly tally. In Q. the Greeks built the Horse *Καλχαντος ἰότῃσι*, and Sinon is taking his cue from Odysseus' earlier 'let us build the Horse *Καλχαντος βουλῇσι*' (80f.); in V. Calchas' instruction (186) is issued on the basis of the long rigmarole about the theft of the Palladium (171f.). The demise of Q.'s Sinon was plotted by 'the Greeks' (380 ~ 35-6) spurred on by Odysseus (380), whereas in V. Odysseus and Calchas are said to be in collaboration to secure this end⁶⁷ (129). Unlike V., Q. does not exploit the common motif of the collaboration of these two individuals in sacrifice stories (e.g. E. IT 16f. ~ 24) but rather isolates Odysseus in the manner of E. IA 1362f. (Achilles says that Odysseus will be the ring-leader in seizing Iphigeneia for sacrifice) or Hec. 131f. (Odysseus presses the Greeks to sacrifice Polyxena⁶⁸). Hunters of Virgilian imitations may look at Stat. *Ach.* 1.493f.; they will find poor pickings in Q.

(iii) 378-9: these lines are of the highest importance in any assessment of relations with V.; they have been very badly handled. 378-9 ~ 37-8 are generally held to correspond to the story of the theft of the Palladium in A. 2.183f.; and, by supporters of Virgilian influence, to constitute a ludicrously compressed reflection thereof⁶⁹. *τί' ταῦτα πρὸς Κόϊντον;* Q. says, twice, that Athene was angered *Τρωῶν ὕπερ*, that is to say, because the Trojans, under her care as tutelary goddess of the city, have been subjected to years of bloodshed⁷⁰. The motif is not new: 1-

Dio Chrys. *Or.* 11.21, the Horse bears a dedicatory inscription: *ἱλαστήριον Ἀχαιοῖ τῇ Ἀθηνῇ τῇ Ἰλίδι*, where the Horse's alleged function is, in Robert's words (230.1) die beleidigte Stadtgöttin von Troia zu versöhnen.

Cedrenus, *Hist. Comp.* § 132, at the receiving end of the Romance tradition.

This is how Sinon justifies the Horse:-

τῇ ἱερῇ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀνατιθέαμι Δαναοὶ τοῦτο, ὁμοῦ
 μὲν ἁπολογία ἐπεὶ ὧν εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῆς ἡδίκησας,
 ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ ἥτορον τοῦτο ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τὰς εἰδυῶν
 πατρίδας ὠτηρίας καὶ εἰς μνημὴν αὐτῶν ἀφιερόν
 κεκρίκαμι δεῖν.

That Athene is strictly pro-Greek is of no practical importance. Thus in

Z 87f. it is perfectly natural for the Trojan women to worship Athene αἰ' κ' ἐλεή' ἑῃ / δέ' τυ ..., as she is, in the words of the worshipper, Ἀθηναίη ἐρυβίπτολι (305; one may recall that when Triph.'s Sinon exhorts the Trojans to admit the Horse he exclaims [302] ἄμμι δ' Ἀθηναίη ἐρυβίπτολις ἡγεμονεύοι 71).

Pindar (Paean 6.87f.) can even say 'what strife did Apollo engage in with Athene Πόλιν' for Troy's salvation.

(iv) 379-82. In V. the Horse is claimed to be a dedicatory offering for a safe return (A.2.17, a story elaborated and given Roman colouring by Sinon at 178f.), and the sacrifice of Sinon to secure good weather for a return is prompted by an involved account of how Apollo's oracle demanded human blood, citing as a precedent the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. The Horse in Q. has nothing to do with the return, which hinges solely upon Sinon's sacrifice (379f. ἄμφ' ἑὸν νόστον ...); and for their homecoming the Greeks must appeal to the gods of the sea, to appease the element in which they reside, just as the chorus in the closing words of Sophocles' Philoctetes appeal to the goddesses of the deep to ensure their safe return: Νυμφαῖς Ἀλφειὸν ἐπευξάμενοι / νόστον ὠτηρίας ἰκέσθαι. One may sacrifice animals for a safe voyage home (e.g. A.R.4.1592f. ~ 1600): to make quite sure Odysseus, whom tradition credits with an undying lust for sacrifice, wants human blood.

(v) 382f.: Virg. A.2.132f.

mihi sacra parari

et salsae fruges et circum tempora vittae,

eripui, fateor, leto me.....

Roman sacrificial trappings in V., naturally: cf. the sacrifice in Sen. Thy. 685f. I cannot see any substance in Keydell's contention (1931, 75) that one

would expect(if, that is, Q. had not been using V.) simply 'I escaped death'. For $\alpha\lambda\delta\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in connexion with human sacrifice cf. E. IA 955f. (Calchas will rue employing $\pi\rho\omicron\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma \chi\epsilon\rho\nu\iota\beta\alpha\varsigma \tau'$ at Iphigeneia's sacrifice), id. 1111f.; for $\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\delta\alpha\varsigma$ cf. xiv. 220.

383-4: if V.'s Sinon hesitates to confess that he ran away, Q.'s Sinon, with an entirely different attitude, gets wind of the plot (382) and promptly makes off, with the resourcefulness of an Odysseus: he darkly attributes his taking refuge at the Horse to the 'will of the immortals'.

384: no elaborate escape in Q.: Sinon just throws himself at the feet of the Horse, a holy and inviolable object.

There is a startling gap in Q.'s version: Sinon does not explain why he specifically was singled out for sacrifice. This is because, I believe, the whole speech is conceived very much as a 'rank and serial number' affair. For another explanation see Vian, Notice 75.

(b) Sinon's story in Triph. In this poem $\alpha\lambda\gamma$ runs riot, so maybe it does not matter very much what Sinon says. In fact, he is brief (and dangerously ambiguous, 297: for $\epsilon\gamma\chi\omicron\varsigma$ see Pfeiffer on Call. F613) and counts on pure assertion, backed by a divine decree ($\theta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\nu$ 297) which is presumably meant to represent an oracular utterance <from...?>. Sinon is equipped with an official prediction in Palaeph. 16: $\phi\rho\alpha\varsigma\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \mu\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\delta\varsigma \epsilon\iota\mu\grave{\eta} \epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\nu\iota\pi\pi\omicron\nu \dots \delta\pi\omicron\delta\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu \textit{Άχαιῶν} \kappa\tau\lambda.$

360

$\alpha\lambda\chi\delta\theta\iota \delta' \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$: cf. v 103, 347 / 2. $\delta' \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$. $\delta\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$: hardly because he looks in sorry plight, as Sinon escaped from his alleged pursuers with ease (383), but because he is ~~going~~ going to be subjected to torture. One may wonder whether Q. is not thinking rather at this juncture of a (self-) mutilated Sinon. In Virgil Sinon repeatedly labels himself miser (70, 79, 131) but the circumstances are of course wholly different.

361

$\kappa\alpha\iota\mu\iota\nu \alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$: hAp. 50 (- νη). $\Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\omega\nu \textit{Ἰπερ}$: but A444 $\textit{Ἰπερ}$ $\Delta\alpha\nu\alpha\omega\nu$.

361-2

ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος /... περιεταδόν : περιεταδόν is a hapax Hom. (παράτε- Zen. Aristoph.), N 551-2 Τρῶες δὲ περιεταδόν ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος / οὐκ ἔτασαν . Cf. here i. 794 ἅσιν δὲ π. ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι /, x. 402 Τρῶαί καὶ Τρῶές με π. ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι . The run περ. ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος / occurs also in Anon. epigr. AppAnth. 312.3, p. 343 (Christian); Gr. Naz. 768.37, 984.188 (ἄλλων id. 1457.79). For the -εταδόν element see Gow on Theoc. 2.68. — Virg. A. 2.63-4 undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus/circumfusa ruit certantque inludere capto. V.'s Trojans only mock, and any physical maltreatment Sinon may have undergone is perpetrated by the shepherds (57f.: back-stage Sophocles?). Keydell's answer to the discrepancy, 'jedoch fürchtet Sinon Schlimmeres (72, 103)' (p. 280) is no answer at all, ignoring as it does, among other things, an essential difference of approach in V.'s depiction of Sinon: he is, or pretends to be, nervous and shaken (cf. 67, 107); Q.'s Sinon is a featureless automaton, ready to take anything that is coming to him: see on 360-388, § 2(a).

362

μέεβον ἐκυκλώσαντο : D. P. 526 / Ἀηλὼν ἐκυκλώσαντο, Nonn. Met. 4.148+2 / Χρυσὸν ἐκ. This aor. med. (also viii. 376), first in [Hes.] F150.28, is common in later verse. ἐκυκλώσαντο περιεταδόν: cf. Gomperz's fine supplement in Call. F260.14 ... μιν ἐκυκλώσαν]το περιεταδόν (περιεταδόν Π), on which see H. Reinsch-Werner, Callimachus Hesiodicus, Berlin 1976, 252, [Apolin.] 117.19 / ἄμφ' ἐμὲ κυκλώσαντο περιεταδόν (Golega 54), and earlier E. Andr. 1136-7 νιν περιεταδόν / κύκλω κατειχόν. ἄμφι δὲ μύθοις : Nonn. has the clausula ἄμφι δὲ -ω / (Met. 10.20, D. 7.106, 38.70). For the form cf. e.g. A. R. 3.1347-8 ἄμφι δ' ἑταῖροι / θάρσυνον μύθοισιν.

362-3

μύθοις / μελιχίοις : cf. Z 343 (= [Orph.] A. 1147) μύθοισι προσηύδα μελιχίοισι /, Bacch. 11.90 μύθοισι .. μελιχίοις . Much more often with ἦπερ (esp. Hom., A. R.), or with no substantive at all.

363

εἶροντο πάρος : ctr. A 553 πάρος ... εἶρομαι (in the past, till now).

παρος, μετέπειτα δ' : cf. κ 519 λ 27 / πρώτα (μελικρήτω), μετέπειτα δ' (... σ' ἔγω /), λ 640. Perhaps we are meant to detect deliberate avoidance of the Homeric pattern which would certainly have been a hackneyed one by Q.'s day:— πρώτον...: Nic., Alex. 256; Nonn. 34.197; Anon. AP 9.452.5. πρώτος : Nonn. 37.554. πρώτα : Ep. Adesp. CA 9 col. iv, 10; Ps.—Phoc. Sent. 8=Or. Sib. 2.60, and orac. AppAnth. 159.2, p.496, OrGr. 204.1 Hendess; [Opp.] Cyn. 1.485; Gr. Naz. 523.14, 559.496; Nonn. Met. 19.181. πρωτίστα : Man. 3.348; [Opp.] Cyn. 1.250-1; Gr. Naz. 605.346, 1543.12.

364

δολόφρονα : one of a host of words examined by A.W. James, Studies in the Language of Oppian of Cilicia, Amsterdam 1970, 74 through the medium of LSJ. It occurs in the following places: Asclep. HE 949; GVI 1515.3 (Sikinos, iia); Or. Sib. 3.217; Oppians: James, s.v.; Nonn. D.: Peek, s.v.; [Apolin.] 11.5, 51.7; Max. 437. Earlier δολιδόφρων (trag.). δολόφρονα φῶτα : cf. Nonn. 18.33 δολόφρονα φῶρα ν-χ. φῶτα δαίμον : similar clausulae in [Orph.] F292.2 (—ονα φ. —εν); Nonn. 17.166 (—ων).

365

πολλὸν ἐπὶ χρόνον : 59n. δ' δ' ἐμπεδον = O683; Σ 158 (ἐπειμένον 157). For the association with μῦνειν cf. μ 161; A.R. 1.659-60. ἦν τε πέτρῃ : cf. ρ 463, O618 cited below, and iv.260 (—ην); Christod. 238 (—αι cf. Theoc. 22.49).

365-6

The imagery recalls ρ 463-4, Odysseus being maltreated by the suitors: δ' δ' ἔταλθη ἦν τε πέτρῃ / ἐμπεδον (sim. O618f.). Cf. too viii.167f. (see Vian there); Arch. GPh 3682-3 ἐμπεδος ὡς τις ἐρίπνα /.. ἐτλης (~ Q. 372); and above all hDion. in GDK 56.21, 24 / ἔβτη δ' ἔβτεμφής, πέτρῃ ἔβος.... θεινόμενος μένεν ἐμπεδον, σὺ [δ' ἔ] λείπε[σεν] / (~ Q. 371). One may discern a vague similarity between Q. 363 (μελιχίσις), 364 (καὶ πολλὰ ...), 365-6 and P 430-1, 434, 436. Knight, op.cit. on 261 above, seems to regard this passage as a 'verbal reminiscence' of Virg. A. 10.693f. (his whole list is a remarkably ill-assorted ragbag).

366

ἄπειρά γυῖα : cf. Emped. F86(ἄμματα); A.R. 4.1375(ῥήμοις); i.710, iv.341 (χέρας); iv.242(κράτα). ἐπαιμένος : Homer uses this participle metaphorically with ἀνδρείην (cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 3.311) and ἀλγὴν (cf. OrGr. 169.5 Hendess). Q. adapts the latter at i.61, ii.523, xiii.219(κατακείμεν—), widens the field with vii.363 /κλῆτος ... κατακείμεναι, i.19+3 ἐπαιμέν— εἶδος /, iii.363 ἐπαιμένοι .. φύσαν /, and tacks on a dative in i.221 μένος κατακείμενοι ῥήμοις / (cf. the literal A.R. 3.45 [misinterpreted?]; Or. Sib. 3.389, 11.216, 12.38, 14.245; v.504) which Castiglioni(45), against his own better judgement, tried to emend away. Vian* adds Orax. Chald. 2.1, 42.2, 115.2 des Places. ὁφείδ' ἔρ' — x = iv.224; cf. 290n.

366-7

ἀντὸν / οὐαθ' : but Λ 633 οὐατα δ' ἀντὸν /; and the sense of οὐατα is different.

367

'Odyssean' punishment: ε 86 (Antinous to Irus: I will pack you off to Ech-etus) / ὅς κ' ἀπὸ βίνα τάλμῃσι καὶ οὐατα, φ 300-1 (Lapithae/Centaur Eurytion) ἀπ' οὐατα ... / βίνας τ' ἀμύχαντες, χ 475-6 / τοῦ δ' (Melanthius) ἀπὸ μὲν βίνας τε καὶ οὐατα ... / τάλμνον. ἀπὸ μελέων: [Theoc.] 25.273; i.746, viii.288, x.124. In Homer always $\frac{1}{2}$ ἀπὸ μ., as elsewhere in Q. (i.334 etc.).

368

ὅπως νημερτέα εἶπη : γ 19. Sinon has been talking all along, but his set speech is postponed in the interests of a simple existence and at the expense of realism: Vian, Notice 74.

369-70

'Where the Greeks had gone along with their ships—or alternatively the Horse—was it keeping<them>inside<its belly>' sounds awkward, but reflects in compressed form the two key questions constantly thrown at Sinon. Had the Greeks gone away on board ship? Or were they inside the Horse? I can see little need for West's repunctuation (adopted by Vian), and no need at all for emendation (e.g. ἡ τὶ καὶ ῥοδομάν; ἡ τινος ῥήπος [sic] Erbse 567). Vian* agrees.

369

ὄππῃ ἔβαν : after Θ 229 / πῇ ἔβαν . ἦέ καὶ ἵππος : similarly Ψ 609 ἦδε καὶ ἵππον / ~ iii.726 (-οι), iv.86, x.2 (-οῖς) = [Apolin.] 31.19.

370

ἐνθέμενος φρεσὶ κάρτος : so i.139 μέγ' ἐνθεμένη φρεσὶ κάρτος /, i.424 / -η φρ. κάρτος , cf. xi.454. At xiv.188 with θυμῷ (after Hom. κότον - μῦθον - χόλον ἐνθεο θυμῷ /).
-χόλον ἐνθεο θυμῷ /).

371

A comparable line at i.568 Αἴας δ' οὐκ ἀλέγισεν Ἀμασόνος, ἀλλ' ἄρα Τρώων.
(At iii.45 / τούτεκα' ἄρ' οὐκ ἀλέγισε Q. recalls Λ 80 / τῶν μὲν ἄρ' οὐκ ἀλέγισε). λῶβης... δεικέος : cf. A.R. 1.816 / λῶβην... δεικέα ~ Λ 142 δεικέα.. λῶβην/. The beggar Odysseus confronts suitors who indulge in / λῶβης .. θυμαλγέος (σ 347 v 285). For ἀλέγ. cf. [Orph.] L.421-2 κελαυνῆς οὐκ ἀλεγίσαν / λῶβης .. γὰρ ... ἀλλ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ : μ 217al., again in Nonn. 31.184, 34.14.

371-2

ἐνὶ θυμῷ / ἐτλη : cf. v.212-3 οἶδε' τι θυμῷ / ἐτλης , viii.260-1 ἀλλ' ἄγε θυμῷ / τλήτε ~ Α 228 / τέτληκας θυμῷ .

372

καὶ πληγῇσι... περ : Sinon is tortured 'both with blows and in the fire'; Spitzner's ὑπὸ πληγῇσι does not merit discussion. Fire-torture is thrown in as an afterthought: Sinon had already considered the possibility in 249-50. τεϊρόμενός περ : ε 324, and so x.284 -όν , x.465, xii.584 -η .

373

ἐργαλέως : 13-14n. Ἥρη γὰρ... : cf. Φ 384. — This is the closest Hera comes in the poem to contact with a human, if the term contact can be applied to a mannered reference to the divine afflatus (for the notion see Richardson on hDem.238). What led Q. to think of Hera at this point rather than Athene, the real driving-force behind the finale, I do not know.

ἐνέπνευσεν μέγα κάρτος : see on 60-1, 266, and cf. / 254-5 κάρτος.. Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη / δῶκονε' ; ii.458.

374

Comparable speech introductions in Virg. A. 2.107, 152f., Triph. 264, Tz. Posth.

690. τοῖα δ' ἄρ' ἐν : cf. η 132 / τῶν δ' ἄρ' ἐν, and for τοῖα heralding a speech i. 99, xiv. 253; xiv. 184. A.R. has τοῖα .. ἀγορεύειν / at 1.350.

δ' ἄρ' ἐν μέλλοις = Σ 507, γ 15; cf. 288 ~ A.R. 1.673. Q. is perhaps using A.R. 2. 79 ἐνὶ μέλλοις ἀγορεύειν /. δολοφρονέων ἀγορεύειν : for the form cf. B 322 θεοπροπέων ἀγορεύειν /, but closer still is [Hes.] F 76.8 δολοφρονέων υυ — x, where a verbum dicendi is to be supplied. Homer has \pm υ δολοφρονέων μετέφη (σ 51 φ 274), \pm υ — εἶνσα προσηύδα (≡ 197a1.).

375

brings to mind the Iliadic Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν νηυσὶ φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδ' ἐβήσαν (M 16) and Ἀργεῖοι φεύγονται ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης (B 159). ὑπὲρ πόντοιο : for ὑπὲρ πόντοιο (verb:) υ — x cf. v. 80 / νῆες δὲ .. ὑπὲρ π. φέροντο /, and iii. 705 (φέρεσθαι), v. 90 (φέρεσκον), xiv. 466 (φέρεσθαι), 540 (φέροντο, Argives on homeward journey); A.R. 2. 271 (φέροντο), 3. 1113 (φέροιεν); Anon. epic. GDK 22.1r5; (Nonn. D. Περ. 7).

376

μακρῶ : cf. xiv. 117, 338. ἀκηδύντες : 'feel indifference', 'get sick and tired', cf. ἀκηδεῖν in A.R. 3. 298 ('torpor') and Vian on x. 16. See next note. καὶ ἀνίη : Gr. Naz. 568.601, cf. η 192 καὶ ἀνίης /. ἀνίη denotes the physical discomfort and mental ~~discomfort~~ stress caused by protracted fighting at Troy (cf. in general the remarks of Giangrande, CCQ n.s. 17, 1967, 89, and Lehrs 75). Q. or his source certainly had in mind the difficult B 291 (Odysseus of the threatened return home) ἀνηδύντα νέεσθαι / — where schol. [291d] gloss ἀκηδιόδαντα.

377

ῥότῃτι : 6n. Perhaps here 'wishes', i.e. prompting, recommendation, on a par with 380 ἐννεσίης, though 'will' may strike the right note if Sinon is using the word with reference to Calchas as a 'holy man' to impress his audience. δαίφρονι Τριτογενεῖ : i. 128 δαίφρων Τριτογένεια / (Athene punisher of Penthesileia). The contexts of these passages (cf. Ov. Met. 2. 752 [punishment of Aglauros] dea bellica) and of xi. 285 (/ Παλλὰς δὲ .. δαίφρονος),

xiv.582-3(-ων / Παλλας) suggest 'warlike' and not 'sagacious' (on δαίφρων ~ δαί' / δαήναι cf. Buttman 1.189f.; Rank 95f.), for which Q. employs περίφρων (iii.533, xi.294; cf. Hes. Th. 894 περίφρονά τέκνα, one of whom is [895] Τριτογένεια) and the open εὔφρων (x.353, xiii.420). Q. applies δαίφρων to a female also in i.47+3, Penthesileia (so Triph. 35): 'He surely got it from some ancient source like the Aethiopis' (C.M. Bowra, On Greek Margins, Oxford 1970, 203): at any rate it is likely to be old (cf. in Roman verse Martia, Mavortia, bellatrix: see Carter, Epithet. Deorum Lat. s. Penthesilea, adding Sil. 8.429), even if archaic epic rarely uses the epithet of women (hDem. 359, cf. Eust. at o 314; but choral lyric suggests wider applications: Pi. P. 9.84f. Alcmena; Bacch. 5.122f. Artemis, 5.137 Althaea).

378

ἵππον ἐτεκτύναντο : 28n. θεῆς χόλον: but δ 583 θεῶν χόλον. For the form θεῆς see on 112. χόλον .. ἀλέωνται : O 223 ἰλαζόμενος χόλον, ὄφρ' ἀλέωνται : cf. Υ 147... / ποίεον, ὄφρα ... ἀλέοιτο /, but Call. provides a closer parallel: F 331 ἐπήλυθιν ὄφρ' ἀλέοιτο /.

379

πάγχυ κοτεδάμεης : = 143 οἱ πωμάλα πάγχυ θεῶν .. κοτεύουσιν /.
Τρώων ὕπερ : cf. 38. ἄμφι δὲ νόστου : A.R. 4.1333 (... θεαί) ἄμφι δὲ νόστου /.

381

δυσχεές : 225n. If Sinon means that there was a specific problem of ἑπλοία (cf. Virg. A. 2.110f.) then he is being vague to the point of lunacy. ἄχχι
θαλάσσης = 143al.; also A.R. 1.553, Opp. Hal. 1.128, D.P. 178, 876, AP 14.115.3 = OrGr. 165 Hendess.

382

δαίμοσιν ἐν ἀλίοις heads a pentam. in Antip. Sid. HE 509; cf. [Orph.] A. 34³ / δαίμονας ἐν ἀλίοις and earlier E. IA 976 ἐν ἀλίοις δαίμονας. Much more often θεοί (cf. iii.671, ix.315-6). ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λείπον : after ε 281-2 ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λείπον ..., / ἀλλὰ ..., L 331 τῷ δ' οὐ λείπον. -ον, ἀλλ' ἀλεγείνας = ix.415.

383

επονίας τ' = Alex. Aet. CA 3.15, Opp. Hal. 5.563; B 341, Δ 159 / επονίας τ'.

ολοχύτας τε = γ 445, A.R. 1.409. μάλ' ἐβουμένως : cf. A.R. 2.894; iv.5 μάλ' ἐββ. ἐναίρως /; [v.l. Λ 158, but poorly supported].

384

ἀθανάτων βουλῇσι : (—iv) Hes. Op. 16 = ix.303. παρὰ ποδὶ κάππεσον : cf. O 280 παρὰ ποδὶ κάππεσε θυμὸς /, and ix.191, x.272, 300.

385

καὶ ... ἀναγκάη : see 100n., and cf. Δ 300 ὄφρα καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων τις ἀναγκάη πολέμῃσι ; β 110al. καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλωνς' ἐπ' ἀνάγκης / ~ ii.315 καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλων περ ἀνάγκη /; GVI 1672.2 (Chersonnese, iii-iv?) ὄν με καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλοντα μολεῖν ἡνάνκαθεν ἄτῃ ; Anon. encom. GDK 36.2.10 (vp) ἤ δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλους [α] τό[ε]ην ἐπέμεινεν [α]νάγκην. Related types of intensification: ε 154-5; hDem. 124; [Mosch.] Meg. 114 (but the v.l. σηίεατο is found alluring by Giangrande, CQ n.s. 19, 1969, 183); Opp. Hal. 5.301-2; Eudoc. Cypr. 1.19-20; Musae. 226; Anon. AP 9.459.4-5.

386

The line resembles D.P. 454 ἄσόμενοι μεγάλοιο Διὸς γόνον Ἡρακλῆα. Cf. also Pampr. GDK 35.3.125 / ἄ[σόμε]νοι μεγάλοιο...; A.R. 4.334 ἄσόμενοι κούρην Διὸς ~ A 21 / —οι Διὸς υἱόν. μεγάλοιο Διὸς : in this sedes M 241, hHerm. 10; 5x in Q., often elsewhere. For Ζεὺς μέγας father of Athene (cf. Z 304al.) see Bissinger 69. Διὸς .. κούρην : for the form cf. E 875 ἄφρονα κούρην /, and i.360 Διὸς κρατερόφρονι βουλῇ / (~ Paul. Sil. Ecphr. Soph. 960-1). But the expression is likely to be old: IG 1(2) 503.1 (before 480 B.C.) Διὸς κρατερόφρονι κόρει ? παιδί ?, sim. id. 393 (c. 550 B.C.), cf. A.E. Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis, Cambridge Mass. 1949, nos. 50, 236. Do we have here a vestige of the dedicatory inscription on the Horse? — A commentary on Ibyc. (PMG 298) mentions κρατ[ε]ρόφρονι Π[α]λ[λ]α[δ]ῃ.

387

ὡς φάτο κερδοσύησι : cf. X 247 / ὡς φασμένη καὶ κερδοσύη, v.l. ant.—υγης. The dat. plur. is rare: Gr. Naz. 536.184, Nonn. 32.2. ἔλγεσι θυμόν : this

iunctura occurs in other parts of the verse at v.459; L568al., Thgn. IEG 1295, Lucill. AP 11.389.5, conj. iii.643; in a dactylic run E. Hipp. 1114,
 ἀκῆρατον ἀλγεῖ θυμόν.

388

Gnomic elements of any substance rarely penetrate the narrative of Homer (E. Ahrens, Gnomen in griechischen Dichtung, Diss. Halle 1937, 9, 12-38) or of A.R. (cf. 1.82, 1035-6, 4.1165f., 1504; also the 'epyllion' [Theoc.] 25.67), but confront the reader of Q. at every turn from i.73-4 onwards. Sententious verbiage (in the vein of late oratory and romance) is characteristic of Nonnos (D. 3.224f., 6.31-2, 56-7 etc.; cf. 42.325f., where a simile is supplanted by a series of generalisations), and of Musaeus (37, 92f., 131f., 164f., 198f.; cf. Kost, Musae. p. 31) and is carried to absurd lengths in the Ὀμηρόκεντρα of Patricius/Eudocia. For the ἀνδρὸς / ἀνδρὶ γὰρ ... sequence (see iii.7f., v.595f., xiv.110f.), which formally resembles the gnomic γὰρ ἀνδρὸς... of drama (e.g. S. F922.1, E. Hec. 844, Ba. 641; cf. also Thgn. IEG 658) cf. Naumach. GDK 29.18 ~ Gr. Naz. 1545.44. — Kehmptzow (20) sees Euripidean gnomologies as a major force in Q.: but E. HF 282f., 1227f. do not look ad verba fere... sumpti to me: nor do the other items in his list on pp. 19-20. ἀνδρὸς .. κρατεροῖο : cf. [429al.; GVI 1260.2 (Bosporos, iia); [Opp.] Cyn. 4.420; iv.37. κακὴν .. ἀνάγκην : not as common as one might have expected: A.R. 3.430; Theoc. 16.85; Anon. hex. (Orph.) ap. Merkelbach, MH 8, 1951, 8.1; [Apolin.] 56.7, 105.73. 'La loi cruelle de Nécessité' (Vian) suits the gnomic tone, but perhaps ἀνάγκη here is closer to 'duress', 'torture', cf. ἀλγεῖ 387. ὑποτλήναι : again iii.571 κακὰς ὑποτλήσομαι ἀνίας /; v.342; conj. xiv.107 (-8: Sinon). Elsewhere only in epigrams: Paul. Sil. AP 5.246.5 [Viansino 68] ~ Agath. id. 5.302.6 [Vians. 54]; Anon. AP 1.183.9.

389-417; 444-499

Laocoon.

If Q. knew of Virgil's treatment of Sinon he did not make use of it in any way that could be called significant. So it is with the Laocoon

episode. There are excellent discussions of Q.'s version in Heinze 68f., Vian Rech. 64f. and Notice to xii, where a number of false scents are obliterated: these I shall not reiterate.

To the bewildering multiplicity of story-lines there may now be added POxy. 2812, a mangled commentary on a tragedy(?)⁷²: p. 41, 21f. Apollo sent the snakes that killed <Laocoon's> son; 33f. Thymbraean Apollo sent snakes (these are named) which left Calydnæ and devoured <Laocoon's> son ἔπερ βωμῶν.

It may be stated at the outset with absolute certainty that Q.'s source or ultimate source was a Hellenistic poem (or poems). The twelfth book prior to the appearance of Laocoon presents us with a profusion of Homeric motifs and is by and large Homeric in general texture. From 395 the linguistic 'register' changes sharply and dramatically and we are in the realm of Hellenistic poetry—as we are on other occasions: cf. e.g. iii. 554f. (lamentation-scene), vii. 336f. (id.), x. 438f. (flight of Oenone), and above all the treatment of Philoctetes in ix, which owes much to Nicander or to didactic verse of a related type⁷³ (see Vian, Notice to ix, 177-8). This is obvious at a glance: curiously, nothing has been made of it hitherto. Lines 399f. are replete with the vocabulary and mannerisms (on which see Schneider, esp. 66f.) which we can now associate only with the didactic verse of Nicander, and with a number of other reflections of Hellenistic techniques and idiosyncrasies; so too are 447f., the snake-attack, and the subsequent lamentation scene. The individual details are recorded in the ensuing commentary. I make no apology for adverting to some Hellenistic mannerisms of a rudimentary nature: if the bulk of the literature on this topic is to be swept under the table it is as well to be sure that it will stay there.

But first, some eclectic observations on the four clear-cut stages of Q.'s version:—

§ 1. 389f. Laocoon's party believe Sinon to be lying. Laocoon claims that the Horse is a trick and presses for its destruction.

Q. agrees with V. in his timing of Laocoon's intervention: the Horse is not

in Troy as yet. But the circumstances of the intervention differ markedly. In V. the traditional debate(see below)is already raging when Laocoon appears with a flourish(40f.)to proclaim that the Horse is a trick,as one party of debaters had done already(35f.),and,more importantly,to violate the Horse with his lance(50f.),an act which explains his fate for the unwitting Trojans(229f.). Not only is all this detail absent in Q.,but Laocoon is wholly integrated into the body of the debate. He and his party declared the Horse $\delta\delta\lambda\omicron\nu \epsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ (392),cf.Tz.Lyc.340,'one party [prior to entry of Horse] $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\eta\gamma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \delta\delta\lambda\omicron\nu \epsilon\tau\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ ',and Triph.239f. Q.'s account of the situation may differ from that of [Apollod.] 5.17 in its location of the debate,but it agrees with it in making Laocoon(together with Cassandra) represent a body of opinion which presses for the destruction of the Horse.

Q. makes all the Trojans emerge from the city(356),and Laocoon is with them,heading one of the two opposing parties(390-1). V. initially gives the same impression in his account of the Trojan reaction to an abandoned shore(25f.),and there is a split into two groups:one accepts the Horse,the other suspects it. Next(40f.)comes Laocoon,primus..ante omnis magna comit- ante caterva/...ab arce:ctr.primus... in 32f. As Bethe has seen⁷⁴,this sequence is not composed with a logician in mind:Laocoon is extracted from the general throng,appears primus from the citadel,and joins in the debate. His action is in fact suitable to a situation in which the Horse is already inside the city. V. is reflecting the<Il.Pers.-> [Apollod.] version wherein Laocoon acts side by side with Cassandra in urging the destruction of the Horse. His sudden incursion into an already electric situation is a masterly piece of dramatic writing;Q. treads a more conventional and a duller path⁷⁵:

For the debate over the Horse's admission or exclusion see Austin on A.2.32,adding Stesich.SLG 88,Triph.250f. Q.'s debate has shed many of the formal trappings. Of the various suggested methods of destruction Q. mentions (in connexion with Laocoon)only burning(cf.infr.445,and Il.Pers.243, [Apollod.] 5.17,Dio Chrys.Or.11.128;Virg.A.2.37). V.'s Laocoon does not consider fire.

His celebrated spear-throw(50f.), which could well be one of a battery of reflections of Roman religious practice⁷⁶, has no place in Q. Keydell(280) ascribes the 'omission' to Q.'s fondness for concision. It may be allowed that V. fills four verses in describing the event; but if Tz. could accommodate the motif in the space of a single undistinguished line(Posth.713), Q. could have done the same.

§ 2. 395f. Athene intervenes and launches two attacks on Laocoon, who is blinded.

The differences in the treatment of Laocoon's mode of punishment could not be more profound. In V. Laocoon and his two sons are killed by the snakes (212f.); in Q. Laocoon is blinded by Athene [Q. only] and the sons are killed. Q.'s description of the blinding bears deep imprints of Hellenistic language and technique: see above. If the popular suggestion⁷⁷ that the blinding of Laocoon⁷⁸, his threefold punishment (two distinct assaults on his person, and the slaughter of his children), and the group-lamentation at the son's⁷⁹ cenotaph all go back to Sophocles' play, they have in the course of their journey to Q. been processed by Hellenistic hands. It may be that the motif of the blinding took on a particular shape in this period under the influence of Callimachus' memorable account of the blinding of Teiresias by Athene (Lav. Pall.: 75 Τειρεσίας δ' ἔτι μῶνος ~ Q. 412+444; 79 χολωδάμεν ~ 396 κοτεδάμεν; 82 ὀμματα νῦν ἐλάβεν cf. 400f.; 89 οὐκ ἐέλινον πάλιν ὀψεί cf. 499; 94f. μάτηρ μὲν γοεῖν οἶτον ληδονίδων ἄγε ... cf. 489f.). One may suspect also that the remarkable particularisation of Laocoon's symptoms — the onset of glaucoma (399-415n.) — was devised in the Hellenistic era by a poet who did not shrink from importing into mythological situations contemporary interest in human physiology, as did A.R. (3.761f.), to take the most striking example⁷⁹.

§ 3. 415f. The Trojans feel pity but decide to admit the Horse.

Q.'s Sinon appears before Laocoon is mentioned: so Petr. 13f.⁸⁰ In V. Laocoon appears on the scene before Sinon is discovered and melts into the background to return later as a sacrificer (201f.). Indeed, V.'s Trojans believe Sinon

(195f.) and seem ready to let the Horse in. Despite frequent claims to the contrary⁸¹, Laocoon's death is not the primary cause of the Horse's admission. It may strengthen the case for it, but the real emphasis resides in Trojan observation that his fate is deserved (228f.)⁸². Q.'s Sinon exerts no such influence and Laocoon all but wins the day (395f.).

§ 4. 444f. Laocoon persists: the Horse must be destroyed. Athene adds to the horror by sending snakes to kill Laocoon's sons. The father is powerless to help. The snakes depart, leaving father and mother to lament their fate. The slaughter of the sons looks at first sight superfluous, as the Horse is already admitted⁸³. But there is motivation. Laocoon persists in urging his companions to destroy the Horse (444f.): true, they are afraid to do so, but there is still a potential threat, or, at the very least, hybriatic behaviour in the face of two dire warnings is still very much in evidence. The death of his sons leaves him a broken man (484f.) and we hear no more of him. Laocoon's opposition to the Horse inside the city is reinforced later by that of Cassandra (525f.) and (as noted above), the duo appear in this capacity in the account of [Apollod.]; cf. Tz. Posth. 708f., where Cassandra is disposed of by Priam and Laocoon violates the Horse apparently [cf. 697 ~ 715] as it is being dragged into the city, so 'causing his son's death' (714).

The snake-attack. Origin: Hellenistic; linguistic correspondences with ~~with~~ V.: practically nil. The only real area of contact is that Athene is in some way involved in the fate of Laocoon and his children:-

(i) As Stubbe has clearly shown (39), Q., in making the snakes vanish into Apollo's shrine (480f.), has combined two distinct versions of the Laocoon story. Laocoon opposes the Horse, but he also opposed Apollo, hence the children are punished: that is why Cypris is said to 'grieve' (460f.). His defiance of Apollo is well attested and works well enough in isolation when a pro-Trojan Apollo is not confronted with a pro-Greek Athene whose sole aim is the safety of the Horse. If Q. had V. before him, it is hard to see why he did not follow him in making the snakes disappear into Athene's shrine. Instead, he has allied himself with a wholly alien tradition, and

in so doing has expressed himself in a manner highly reminiscent of Hellenistic poetry(480-1n.). If V. did devise the association of Athene with the snakes(and we do not know that he did), this still does not show that it was he who induced Q. to do the same, not only because he was bound by his own narrative, but because this association is a familiar one⁸⁴: at B 308-19, the portent of the snake that devours the fledglings [cf. Q. 491f.], schol. remark: ὁ φρακὺν Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερός . If we have to look anywhere for an explanation of Athene's rôle, we should be looking in this direction, and not making straight for A.2.

(ii) The snake-story is moulded by V., as Kleinknecht(67f.) has finely demonstrated, in the form of a Roman prodigium: in an episode divested of nearly all(Tenedos 203) mythological trappings(Kleinknecht 105) the snakes advance mysteriously, relentlessly, perform their gruesome task, and vanish into Athene's shrine. It is worth noting that Q.'s Athene directs operations in living presence: she puts the scheme into operation(448), summons the snakes from their lair(454f.), spurs them on(461) to their destination, roots Laocoon and his sons to the spot(473f.). Q.'s handling invites comparison not with V. but rather with such passages as Pi. N. 1.39f. ~ Theoc. 24.11f. If the atmosphere of the prodigium is normally lost in the Roman epigoni(e.g. V. Fl. 2.478f., cf. Heyne on A. 2.209-11), at least we have clear linguistic echoes which would have handed on some of V.'s ideas to posterity if his poem had perished. Q. has not been so obliging.

For more on certain formal aspects of V.'s handling of Laocoon see on 525-585.

389

τῷ ... ἀπείθοντο : cf. i. 781, iv. 378 / ἀλλ' οἳ μὲν ἀπείθοντο . κατὰ στρατόν : similarly A 318 ὡς οἳ μὲν τὰ πένοντο κατὰ στρατόν, οὐδ' οὐ - x , N 329 ἔφικοντο κατὰ στρατόν, ix. 415 ... ἔμμεν ἔφαντο κατὰ στρατόν.

390

ἐμμεναι ... : λ 363-4 ὁ δ' ἐμμεναι .. ἡπεροπῆα τ' ἐμμεν καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπῶν, σῆα

... ἡπερ, could well be traditional: cf. γ 130a (Troy, captured) βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισι καὶ ἡπεροπηγίδι τέχνῃ, with M. van der Valk, Textual Criticism of the Odyssey, Leiden 1949, 279. For πολύτροπον see on 171.

390-1

βουλῇ / ἤνδαυε reverses Σ 510a1. ἤνδαυε βουλῇ /.

391

πεπνυμένα βάλων : / 58, δ 206 (— εις).

392

An exceptionally clumsy line, even for Q. Paraphrase of prose text? φῆ
δόλον εἴμμεναι : cf. λ 237 / φῆ... γυνὴ εἴμμεναι, and v. 457 οἶδατο γὰρ
δόλον εἶναι / after κ 232, 258 ([Opp.] Cyn. 4.228). δóλον .. αἰνόν : 15n.
ὅπ' ἐννεδίκησιν Ἀχαιῶν : we find similar clausulae in ix. 325, xiv. 352.

393-4

Ctr. Virg. A. 2.37-8 (Capys and his party) urere flammis / aut terebrare... et temptare latebras. ἵππον, / ἵππον δουράτεον : for this kind of epanalepsis cf. vi. 470-1, xiv. 207-8, and (e.g.) Nonn. 38.301-2. Homeric patterns (cf. Fehling 184f.) are echoed in: (a) i. 770-1, ii. 100-1, iv. 186-7, x. 190-1, proper name (but Ἰνέρι ... iii. 613-4) + relative clause. (b) iii. 74-5, from γ 371-2. Other examples without strict parallels in Homer: i. 697-8 (ἡέ Tychsen) ~ xi. 275-6; vii. 632^f ; v. 562-3; xiii. 30-1. — i. 369-70 and (ὀππόττε Platt 121) viii. 29-30 are doubtful. — See Kost on Musae. 5-8.

394

ἵππον δουράτεον : 139n. δουρ, is contemptuous: cf. Virg. A. 2.45, where Laocoon labels the Horse hoc...ligno, 'this lump of wood'. καὶ γινώμεναι : cf. Φ 266 — ον καὶ γινώμεναι εἴ' μιν ἴπαντες / ..., 609. εἴ' τι κέκευθε : γ 18 / εἴ' ὅμην ἤντινα ... κέκευθε / (cf. id. 19 ~ Q. 368; 20 ~ Q. 391).

395

καί' ῥύ' κέ' οἰ = Ψ 540; cf. on 93-4. A similar idea in a more elaborate form in Virg. A. 2.54-6 — similar, but not identical: there fate and αἴ' τη are operative, here we are served up with the usual epic sign of divine disapproval which culminates in the reversal of a developing situation.

-οντο ... ὀλεθρον :Opp.Hal.2.240 -αντο καὶ ἐξήλυθαν ὀλεθρον /,cf.γ 297
 ἤλυθαν ὀλεθρον / and vi.22. For ἐξάλύκω see LSJ;ix.261,xiv.580(f.).

396

εἰ μὴ Τριτογένεια =vii.143. Κοτεσσαμένη :at Σ 367 Hera is described as
 Τρώεσσι Κοτεσσαμένη (cf.also Ε 177),at Ξ 191 Aphrodite as Κοτεσσαμένη τῶς
 θυμῷ /;cf.v.418 -ος περὶ ταυχέων/. περὶ θυμῷ :Homer has ἀλύβοιτες
 περὶ θυμῷ /(X 70),where περὶ is adverbial. In Q. it is probably always
 a mere equivalent of ἐνί (cf.on περὶ φρεσίν in 241):ii.35,iii.285,v.428
 μέγ' (!) ἄχρυνόμενος περὶ θ. /;vii.480 οἰομένους ;xiii.56 ὀρινόμενοι.

397

αὐτῷ ... ἔλτε :cf.x.473(and 392),infr.520;O 449= P 291;γ 381.

397-8

Like sequences follow:xiv.580-1 καί ν' κε ἐξήλυζε κακὸν μόνον,εἰ μὴ ὅγ'
 (Poseidon)αὐτῷ / ῥήξας γαῖαν ἐνέρθεν...;xiii.548 θεῶν τις ... γαῖαν
 ἐνέρθε /ῥήξεν ἀπειρεσίην ;xiv.646 γαῖαν ἐνέρθε /ῥήξε Πτοερδῶν. All
 owe something to Υ 57-8 ἐνέρθε (vulg.:νέρθε v.l.,Ar.)Πτοερδῶν ἐρύναξε /
 γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ,hDem.429 γαῖα δ' ἐνέρθε /. For ἐλέλιξεν cf. [Opp.] Cyn.
 4.302-3 ἐν δ' ἐλέλιξον / γαῖαν ,and 95n.

398

θεεπεσίην : 'vast' rather than 'divine' (Vian):cf. ἀπειρεσίην in the examples
 cited in previous note,and x.462 /ῥήην θεεπεσίην , 'an enormous pile of
 wood'.

399-415

A remarkably vivid and descriptive passage,certainly Hellenistic in origin:
 Laocoon suffers first a much accelerated attack of congestive glaucoma
 (cf.i.76f.,and for clinical details P.D.Trevor-Roper,Ophthalmology,London
 1962,498f.;Behre and Öberg provide an interesting historical survey of the
 term in Lychnos 1962,164f.)characterised by an excruciating trigeminal
 neuralgia,inflammation of eyelids and cornea,severely impaired vision,profuse
 lacrimation,and,no doubt,feverish convulsions(μαινομένην 411);through his
 continued defiance,it is made absolute.

399

ἔμπεε δέμα :200n. τρόμος and γυνή are associated in Homer in the formula τρόμος ἔλλαβε (...) γυνή /; also, and more importantly, in Nicander, cf. Ther. 437; Alex. 541. τρόμος δ' ἑμφέκλασε γυνή : for the general shape cf. viii. 345-6 δέος δ' ἑμφέκλασε θυμόν / Νυμφάων (ἐτέρπε 344); for the verb 400-1n., and x. 372 / γυνή δ' ἑπεκλάσθησαν (τρόμῳ 371); xiii. 183 κλάσθησαν ... γυνή / (περιτρομέων 185); xi. 84 ἑπέκλασε δ' ἔψα πάντα / ~ Nic. Ther. 728 γούων δ' ὑποέκλασε δέμα / sc. κάρος → Max. 258 ποδῶν ὑποέκλασεν ἄρθρα / (Nic. accounts for the 'insolens forma' in Max., surprisingly overlooked by Ludwig ad loc.).

400

ἄνδρὸς ὑπερθύμοιο =xiv. 552 (of Ajax, being punished by Athene); also in GVI 1582.2 (Rome, ii-iii), cf. Stesich. PMG 266 ὑπερθυμέετατον ἄνδρῶν. For ἄνδρὸς see 402n.; for ὑπερθύμοιο, 161n. περὶ κρατὶ : cf. EpGr. 786.3 Kaibel (Halicarnassus, iia?) ὅς περὶ κρατ[ί] /. In other parts of the verse: [Orph.] H. 12.11; Mel. HE 4234, xi. 112; Theoc. 7.64, GVI 1881.5 (Sardis, ii-i), ix. 364. In Homer the phrase is split up: T 380-1.

400-1

μέλαινα ἐχύθη looks more Homeric than anything Nic. or his like might write (cf. Schneider 85f.; ctr. Ther. 430-1), cf. Ξ 438-9 (mortally wounded) τὴν δέ σ' ὄβρε / νῦξ ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα. Q. has a comparable sequence at i. 596 [ὑπεκλάσθη μελέεσσιν /] -598. For νῦξ of blindness cf. Call. Lav. Pall. 82 παῖδός δ' ὄμματα νῦξ ἔλαβεν /; for ἐχύθη, viii. 313 (slain warrior) ὁλοή δέ σ' ἀμφεχύθη [hence Λ here?] νῦξ / (/ νῦξ (δ') ἐχύθη is used literally at viii. 490, al.); Hes. Th. 726-7 (literal) ἀμφὶ δέ μιν νῦξ / .. κεχύται περὶ δεργὴν; and N 544al., E 696al. ~ A.R. 4.1525.

401

εὐγερὸν ... ἄλγος : cf. xiii. 286. κατὰ βλεφάρων : in this sedes xiv. 269; x. 432, xiv. 302 ~ [Mosch.] Meg. 57. Ctr. P 438, Nonn. 28.109. πέεον ἄλγος : so iii. 584 πάθειν δ' ἄλγεινόν ὑπὸ κραδίην πέεον ἄλγος (sim. xiv. 272-3); viii. 203 ὁλοή δέ κ' ὀφθαλμῶν πέεον ὀρφνῇ /. Suggested perhaps by V 282 καὶ δ' ἄλγος σ' χύτο μυρίον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν /.

402

εὖν δ' ἐ'χ'εεν : cf. xiv.461, and below on 405-6. λαβίησιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσιν : Alexandrine, cf. Diosc. HE 1465 γλῆναι (~ Q.403) λαβίασιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσιν, and Theoc. 11.31. ἐπ' ὀφρύσιν : Bion 1.10 ἐπ' ὀφρύσι δ' ὄμματα - x. Variations in i.58-9 (ὀφθαλμοί), ix.374 (ὀπωπαί); Hom. ὀ'66ε (O 607-8, = 236, cf. Hes. Th. 826-7 corr. West, Pancrates GDK 15.2ii.17). ὄμματα φωτός : Λ 614 (taken into an anapaestic run at A. Ag. 796; cf. also E. Ion 732). Ctr. ix.374 ἀνδρὸς ὀπωπαί / (Philoctetes) ~ Nonn. 5.391 (imit. Hom.). φωτός : man=victim, a Nicandrian locution, e.g. Alex. 124-5 ἀλὴ δέ φιν ἤ'θεα φωτός / ἄψυχος πεδάει, Ther. 428 (ἀνδρὸς ~ supr.400).

403

ἀργαλέησι ... ὀδύνησιν : Ep. Adesp. CA 1.10a / -έων ὀδυνῶν ; ix.408=Max.152 -έων -άων (/). πεπαρμέναι ἀμφ' ὀδύνησιν : on ἀμφ' in this expression see G. Zuntz, *Persephone*, Oxford 1971, 192.2. Homer (E 399) has simply ὀδύνησι πεπαρμένους, cf. Archil. IEG 193.2-3 χαλεπήβη .. ὀδύνησιν .. πεπαρμένους, v.390 corr. ὀδύνησι πεπαρμένους .. ἦτορ / (variations: x.244, 326) but ἀμφ' ὀδ. πεπ. Emp. F112.12 suppl. Bergk χαλεπήβη πεπαρμένοι <ἀμφ' ὀδύνησιν> /, and subsequently A.R.4.1066-7 ἦτορ / ὀξείης .. πεπαρμένον ἀμφ' ὀδύνησιν /, [Orph.] L.496 / πικρήβη .. γυῖα πεπαρμένους ἀμφ' ὀδύνησιν /. ἀμφ' ὀδ. without πεπ. is early: Archil. IEG 13.4 ἀμφ' ὀδύνης (corr. Gaisford). Other examples: (a) ὀδύνη : A.R.2.96 corr.; GVI 448.2 (Syracuse, vp); (b) plur.: - ὀδύναις : [Apolin.] 30.22; ὀδύνης : v.288 (c.v.1.); ὀδύνησιν (/) : [Opp.] Cyn. 3.426, Gr. Naz. 600.287, [Apolin.] 93.36.

404

ῥίσιθ' ἔθεν : also vi.381. In didactic verse Nic. Ther. 307, Alex. 257 (both descriptions of symptoms), Marc. Sid. GDM 63.46, of the eyes Anon. AP 11.126.3-4 ἔξέπαγε τὸ βλέφαρόν μου / ῥίσιθ' ἔθεν. The word occurs also in GVI 101.2; [Apolin.] 76.38, 140.17; AppAnth. 22.4, p.568 ~ 51.4, p.573 (iambic). ἐκλινέοντο : common in Nic., e.g. Ther. 246 ('convulse'), Alex. 581.

405-6

have much in common with the description of the furious temper of Ajax, v.325-8: περὶ κραδίην δ' ἀλεγείων / ἴξεν ἄχος, καὶ δριμὺ δι' ἐγχεφάλῳιο

θεμέθλων / ἐβούμενον μῆνιγγας ἄδην ἀμφηλυθεν ἄλγος, δὴν δ' ἔχεν
νόον ἀνδρός.

405

ἄχος ... ἴκανεν: cf. B₁₇₁ μιν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἴκανεν /, Θ₁₄₇, al.

Similar in structure is x.291 ἄχος δ' ἀλεγεινὸν ἀλάλκε/. Cf. v.325-6 (above),
and A.R. cited on 406.

406

ἄχρη .. ἐς: cf. ii.470, al. Of the penetration of pain A.R.3.763f. (ὀδυνη
γούχουκα) κεφαλῆς ἐπὶ νείατον ἰνίον ἄχρης, / ἐνθ' ἀλεγεινότεατον (~
405) δύνει ἄχος ..., cf. ἐς ὀβέτον ἄχρης (~ ix.376) in Theoc.3.17.

μῆνιγγας: mentioned in v.327(405-6n.); Nic. Ther.557 ἐγκεφάλοιο .. βμῆνιγγας,
cf. Nonn.4.386, 10.24; 29.255. ἰδ' ἐγκεφάλοιο θέμεθλα: so v.326 (above). For
the form of Hes. Th.816 Ἀκεανοῖο θέμέθλοισ/. —οιο θέμεθλα / also ii.542
(ετέρνοιο ~ [Orph.] H.17.3 βαθυετέρνοιο), xi.45: cf. ≡493, P₄₇; A.R.
4.118; Eudoc. Cyp₁.1.34.

407-8

ὅτε μὲν ... ὅτε δ' αὖτε: cf. A.R.1.1270-1, and iii.432-3. Disjunctions of
this type are frequently encountered in Nic., e.g. Ther.256-7; see Schneider
120.

407

αἵματι πολλῷ: ε₃₉₇=Anon. HE 3774 (πεφυρμένον ...), ε₃₃₆; Or. Sib.5.201
(πληρώμενος); v.27,450 (μεμορυμένον), vi.255 (—ος), viii.275, xiii.144
(μελαινόμεν?).

408

δυσάλθε: for this and congeners see in general N. van Brock, Recherches sur
le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien, Paris 1961, 198f. A Lieblingswort of
Nic. (Ther.187,466; Alex.12,157,597, [v.1.586, but see Gow, CQ n.s.1, 1951, 101,
van Brock 200]), it was no doubt as widespread in post-Hellenistic didactic
verse as it was in other genres: cf. Lyc.796, Polyaen. GPh 3943, Gr. Naz.760.59
+3, [Apolin.] 31.5 +2, Christod.179,188; and orac. ap. West, ZPE 1, 1967, 184
(2b2) [assigned 'all' età adrianea o a quella immediatamente successiva' by
Pugliese Carratelli, Ann. Sc. Arch. At.41-2, 1963-4, 351]; orac. ap. Cougny, AppAnth.

237, p. 515 (s.v. 1.). — Q. shares the synonymous $\delta\upsilon\alpha\lambda\theta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (ix. 388 — οἰκίη .. ὁδὸν ἔτι / ~ Anon. encom. GDK 36.3.8 $\delta\upsilon\alpha\lambda\theta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ οἰκίη /) with Man. (6.624) and Nonn. (Met. 5.16). $\delta\upsilon\alpha\lambda\theta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in contrast goes back a good deal further (Il. Pers. F5.6): iii. 33 (ἰόντ ~ [Opp.] Cyn. 2.424 οἰκίη cf. Nonn. 36.217; iii. 84; iv. 401 $\tau\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ cf. Nic. Alex. 246 $\tau\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ = Bion F1.4 corr.); ix. 385; also Man. 2.499. $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$: in early epic of lions, γ_{172} / $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\omega\nu$, Scut. 430 / $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\omega\nu$ δ' οὐδ' οὐδ' ~ vii. 488 ὀμμασι $\gamma\lambda\alpha\upsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ /; of the eyes in [Opp.] Cyn. 3.70-1 (κόραι), 4.311 (ὀπωπήν). See in general Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 86.

409-10

Nic. deploys a number of similes, particularly to lend impact to descriptions of medical disorders (Ther. 4²2f. / σῖον ὅτε ...); Schneider 105f. — Cf. p 209-10; Hes. Th. 785-6 ~ Theoc. 1.8 ~ i. 295. The present simile, which invites formal comparison with iii. 576f., vii. 229f., x. 415f., may have been suggested by the frequent association of tears with water falling from a rock-face (cf. I 4f., II 3f.; E. Andr. 532f., Suppl. 79f.; Catul. 68.57f. appropriately punctuated) and of weeping with melting snow ~ rivers (τ 204f. cf. Ov. Ep. 13.52, Am. 1.7.57f., Tr. 3.2.19f., Pont. 2.3.89f.; [Ov.] Cons. Liv. 101f.; Sen. Phaed. 381f.; Stat. Theb. 11.193f.). But the Hellenistic source may have had the idea already: Nic. uses a related field of imagery (in a different connexion) at Ther. 254-5.

409

σῖον ὅτε: 267n. Gerhard's rearrangement of codd. must be right: presumably $\lambda\pi\delta\ \epsilon\tau$, arose from a desire for simplex ordo, even if the end result is far from satisfying that principle. $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$.. $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\varsigma$: the fem. - $\lambda\eta$ (cf. W. Kastner, Die griechischen Adjective zweier Endungen auf -Oς, Heidelberg 1967, 109) is common from A.R. on. The $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha$ of tragedy (A. Pr. 748, E. IT 1429 and (conj.) Ba. 1137-8) becomes $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta$ π. in the hexameter ([Opp.] Cyn. 4.278, and 7x in Q., cf. here xi. 368 $\omega\tau\ \text{---}\ \eta\varsigma$ $\lambda\pi\delta\ \pi.$ /, i. 295 - $\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\psi\omicron\delta\epsilon\ \pi.$ /; infr. 449 $\lambda\pi\delta\ \epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$ / ~ hHerm. 124 $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega\ \lambda\pi\delta\ \pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$ /). — Q. has $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ also with $\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha$ (xi. 466, cf. S. Ant. 250), $\sigma\upsilon\delta\alpha\varsigma$ (iii. 580, ix. 357), $\delta\omicron\delta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (conj. ix. 384 cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 3.442; with $\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ codd.). $\lambda\pi\delta\ \pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\varsigma$: cf. xi. 368. There seems to be no

other instance of an adj. of the shape $\psi\psi-$ before this clausula(ctr.:
 $\psi-\psi\psi-$:A.R.CA F5.3 cf. Nonn. Met. 19.216, D. 13.319, 45.309; $\psi-----$:Crin. GPh
 1779; $-\psi\psi-$:Nonn. 43.416, Anon. AP 6.42.5; $-----$:Opp. Hal. 5.224). It is
 most often, from Homer on, preceded by a monosyllable: cf. i. 549, xi. 483 $\epsilon\tau' \alpha\pi\delta$
 $\pi.$ /; viii. 405 $\delta' \nu\tau'$ ~ D. P. 1076 $\delta' \nu \rho'$ leg. $\delta' \nu \tau'$ (cf. the variants), sim.
 'Plato' ^{Ep} ~~Gr.~~ 557 Page; Triph. 191.

410

$\epsilon\zeta \delta\rho\epsilon\omega\nu$: Philit. CA 10.1; Arat. 118 ($\nu\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron \delta'$ cf. infr.); A. R. 1.1100, 2.400,
 976; [Opp.] Cyn. 2.80. Otherwise at the beginning of the verse, x. 173 ($\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha$)
 xiii. 45 ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\eta\epsilon$), xiv. 6 ~ Π 392, χ 303 ($\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$), Pampr. GDK 35.3, 137,
 Colluth. 7 ($\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$; for the reading cf. Livrea, Helikon 1/4, 1969, 4; ZPE 17, 1975,
 35). $\pi\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$: a fine touch.

411

$\mu\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta \delta' \eta' \iota\kappa\tau\omicron$: the 'derangement' (see 399-415n.) that accompanies a
 wide variety of disorders (madness in antiquity was ill defined in clinical
 terms) is expressed in epic phraseology, exactly as in Nic. (see Schneider
 88f.): cf. Σ 389 / $\mu\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta \epsilon' \iota\kappa\omega\alpha$, Theoc. 2.51 / $\mu\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta \iota\kappa\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$; and
 for the form v. 28 / $\delta\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta \eta' \iota\kappa\tau\omicron$ (ecphrasis) ~ Christod. 20, 348 / $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$
 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \epsilon' \iota\kappa\tau\omicron$. $\eta' \iota\kappa\tau\omicron$: see Jones, CR n.s. 3, 1953, 75. $\epsilon' \delta\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon \delta\iota\pi\lambda\omicron\alpha$: in
 Nic. Alex. 28 the consumer of aconite is described thus: $\tau\alpha \delta\epsilon \delta\iota\pi\lambda\omicron\alpha \delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha$
 $\delta' \epsilon\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ /; moreover (id. 24) / $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon \dots \epsilon\kappa \phi\alpha\epsilon\omega\nu \dots \epsilon\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \iota\delta\rho\omega\varsigma$ / (~
 supr. 409f.). In adapting the double-vision routine of E. Ba. 918f. Nonn.
 (interpreting the phenomenon of course as a symptom of intoxication, as did
 Clem. Alex., cf. Dodds on Ba. 918-9) uses language akin to that of Nic. and Q.:
 15.20, 16.259, 46.125.

412

$\alpha\iota\nu\alpha \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \varsigma\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omega\nu$: this and xi. 205 / $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \varsigma\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omega\nu$ recall Σ 318
 / $\pi\upsilon\kappa\rho\alpha \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \varsigma\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omega\nu$; cf. x. 423 (sim. id. 253) / $\alpha\iota\nu\alpha \delta' \alpha\nu\alpha \varsigma\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha$.
 $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu$: Υ 52 $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omega\nu$ /; similarly viii. 248, xi. 43 $\frac{1}{h}$ ~
 O 717, Π 78.

413

$\sigma\delta' \alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\epsilon$: cf. A₁₆₀, M₂₃₈ $\sigma\delta' \alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\epsilon\varsigma -\omega$ / . $\mu\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\omicron$: used of

the effects of disease by Nic. (Ther. 428, 587); cf. ix. 411 (Philoctetes), and $\mu\omicron\gamma\eta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ in i. 76. $\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \dots \epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\theta\lambda\omicron\nu$: only in Q. (cf. vii. 65) and in Gr. Naz. (1499. 268). $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\theta\lambda\omicron\nu$: perhaps 'sainte' (Vian), perhaps 'wholesome', 'sweet' [cf. A. R. 2. 184, Theoc. 24. 75] or the like. $\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \dots \lambda\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\epsilon$: cf. LSJ $\lambda\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega$, and [Opp.] Cyn. 2. 619 / $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\iota$ (Phineus) $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\omicron\varsigma \lambda\mu\epsilon\rho\epsilon\epsilon\nu$.

414

$\delta\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\eta'$: once in the Doloneia, K 290 / $\epsilon\nu\nu \epsilon\alpha\iota$, $\delta\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha'$ (~ IME 103.9 [early Ptolemaic period] / $\lambda\lambda\lambda\epsilon \epsilon\nu$, $\delta\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha'$; also Max. 113) for the usual $\delta\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha\iota\nu$ /, as, reversely, Od. $\pi\omicron\tau\nu\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha\iota \sim$ hDem. 118 [=iv. 272] $\pi\omicron\tau\nu\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ /. On this and related expressions see Jacobsohn 191; $\delta\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\alpha'$ in Homer has nothing to do with the notion that $\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ could be regarded as an equivalent of $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (L. Bergson, L'épithète ornementale dans Eschyle, Sophocle et Euripide, Lund 1956, 114, 146). $\theta\epsilon\eta'$: 112n. $\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon \beta\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho' \dots \omicron\pi\omega\pi\alpha\iota'$: ctr. [Opp.] Cyn. 3. 348, Naumach. GDK 29. 67 $\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon \beta\lambda\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\iota\nu \omicron\pi\omega\pi\alpha\iota'$ (- $\alpha\iota\varsigma$) /, both of which may be added to Kost's post-Alexandrine examples of $\omicron\pi\omega\pi\alpha\iota'$ = eyes (on Musae. 101). $\epsilon\beta\tau\alpha\nu \omicron\pi\omega\pi\alpha\iota'$: cf. τ 211-12.

415

$\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\zeta \omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron$ =iv. 24, but here $\epsilon\zeta$ = as a result of, following upon. For the expression cf. A. R. 4. 559-60 $\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu\nu \dots / \alpha\iota\mu'$ [δ 611 / $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\zeta \lambda\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\tau\omicron$: $\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\tau\omicron$ Crates]; for the form A. R. 1. 498; ii. 104, xiv. 91; [Apolin.] 17. 106. $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\epsilon \delta\epsilon \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$: cf. v. 321 $\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\chi\eta\epsilon \delta\epsilon \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ /, xi. 469-70 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\chi\eta\epsilon \delta\epsilon \dots / \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$. The motif of $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma / \lambda\alpha\omicron\iota$ -reaction to weighty events, familiar from Homer (cf. also S. Tr. 783 ~ El. 749f.) is widespread in Q. : e.g. i. 62 (joy), iii. 504f. (grief), iv. 147f. (wild applause), v. 568f. (lamentation), xiv. 57f., 349f. (astonishment).

416

$\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu \dots$: cf. L 516. $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\nu \lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\delta\epsilon\alpha$: in this sedes χ 168, Theoc. 1. 141, Naumach. GDK 29. 41, Nonn. Met. 4. 82. In what way he was $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, we are not told. $\lambda\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu \lambda\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\eta\nu$: cf. E 765 $\lambda\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\eta\nu \lambda\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\eta\nu$ /, α 420 $\lambda\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu \theta\epsilon\omega\nu \sim$ xiv. 439 $\lambda\theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\nu$. $\lambda\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is very frequently applied to important individual deities in post-Alexandrine verse; not so before, D. L.

Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford 1955, 5. Ἀγέλειν : what meaning Q.

attached to this title (cf. West on Hes. Th. 318; LexfrEp s.v.) I should not like to conjecture. Cornut. ND 20 has the form Ἀγελίς.

417

ἐρρίγως ... : cf. ψ 216 / ἐρρίγει μὴ τις ... ; A.R. 3.637 / δειδῆα μὴ .. δῆ' τῷ ...
μὴ ... ἀφραδίῃσιν : so x.305 εἰ καὶ τι παρήλιτον ἀφραδίῃσιν / α
 A.R. 2.246 (νόος ἔνδον 248) θεοὺς .. παρήλιτες ἀφραδίῃσιν / (Hes. Op. 330
 ἀφραδίης ἀλιταίνητ'), id. 3.891 ἥ μέγα δῆ' τι παρήλιτον . For difficulties
 of text and interpretation hereabouts see Vian's full discussion; with Erbse
 (564) I would accept West's ingenious transposition (419.418.421.420) without
 hesitation; and so now Vian*. παρήλιτον : ἀλιτεῖν is well defined by
 Vos, Glotta 34, 1955, 290: 'beleidigen..., jemandem Unrecht tun mittels Besitzraub
 oder Ehrenschändung und so ihn persönlich kränken'.

418-443

Sinon and Horse are taken into Troy.

See Vian, Rech. 68-9.

418

αἰὼν ὀλεθρον : 355n. νόος ἔνδον : claus. in Gr. Naz. 516.15; in other
 sedes A.R. 2.248, 4.3, cf. Opp. Hal. 4.337. Q. has the Homeric φρένας ἔνδον
 at i.605 (~ A.R. 2.639), vii.691, xiii.6.

419

μογεροῖο : cf. 581n. This is a common epithet in Q., of persons ~~except~~ with the
 exception of iii.203. It is well established in Hellenistic verse (Arat. 179
 +4, A.R. 3.853, 4.37, Nic. Ther. 823, Ariston. HE 790); thereafter upward of 50
 examples outside Q. (vii.666, x.142 τοκῆος - ἡς cf. Anon. AP 7.328.5 = GVI
 1954.9; vii.310, xiii.555 ἀνθρώποισιν cf. Arat. 1101-2; Gr. Naz. 526.55).

420

ἐλπομένοι κατὰ θυμόν : vi.83 (- νη), cf. K 355 / ἔλπετο γὰρ κατὰ θυμόν.
ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἀγορεύειν : cf. Ps. - Phoc. Sent. 7 ἐτήτυμα πάντ' ἀγορεύειν /
 [but πάντα φυλάσσειν / Or. Sib. 2.58], Eudoc. Arg. Hom. 5 (- ευεν /), and Gr. Naz.
 551.388 πάντ' ἀγορεύεις ἐτήτυμα . Homeric forerunners are α 174a1. τῶντ'

ἀγορεύον ἐτήτυμον and γ 254 π 61 (cf. hDem. 433; Theoc. 5.76) ἀληθεῖα πάντ' ἀγορεύ(ε)ω /. The clausula πάντ' ἀγορεύ—/(also ii. 320, vi. 149, infr. 554) is much affected by later poets: e.g. Or. Sib. 3.6, 12.296, D.P. 345, [Apolin.] 51.6. — Ctr. Virg. A. 2.77f. (Sinon loq.) cuncta...fatebor/vera.

421

μιν ... ἄεττο: cf. Ψ 696 $\frac{1}{2}$ μιν ἄγον; N 657 ἄγον προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρήν /, Ω 151 ἄγοι προτὶ ἄεττο, al. Τρώϊον ἄεττο: 19n.

422

ὄψέ περ = vii. 144; with partic.: φ 7 ὄψέ περ ἐλθών /. οἰκτεῖραντες : more because of his beating-up than his 'escape' from the Greeks. Ctr. Virg. A. 2.145 miserescimus sc. Sinon in view of his story; Triph. 265.

423f.

The chorus in E. Tr. 537f. describe the Trojans as hauling the Horse with ropes 'like a ship' (cf. 428n.). Triph.'s Sinon (300f.) urges them to drag the Horse to the acropolis with ropes, and, δηδάμενοι βερῆειν (306), they haul it over the plain with κάλως (ibid.). For elaboration Triph. turns to the description of the launching of Argo in A.R. 1.367f. (a passage used also by [Orph.] A. 243f., cf. Paul. Sil. AP 10.15.3-4 [Viansino 25]): — Triph. 320 ~ A.R. 388f.; 322 ~ 389; 323 ~ 387; 332 ~ 381, 384. So too Q. (could we be dealing rather with a common [Alexandrine] source?): — Q. 423 βερῆν ~ 391 ἀναβείραντες; 424 δηδάμενοι καθύπερθεν ~ 369 τευναίμενοι ἐκκ' ἐπερθεν; 426 ἔπηται ~ 386 ἔπετο; 427 ἐλκόμενος .. ὑπὸ χεῖρεσιν ~ 373 ἐλκόμενῃ χεῖρεσιν; 428 ἐπιβρίδαντες ~ 384 βρίδαντε; 429 ἔω λῖος ~ 372, 390; 430-1: variation on 388-9; 431 τρόπῃς ~ 388; 432 ἀμφίς ~ 392; 432 ὀλιβαίνουσα ~ 377 of. 390; 434 ἀμφί cf. 392. — Ropes are mentioned by Virg. also, but with only a whiff of nautical terminology: Austin on A. 2.236.

423

βερῆν ἀμφεβάλοντο : similarly Triph. 300-1 βερῆειν .. ἀμφιβαλόντες / ἔλκετ' ... περικηκεῖ ἵππῳ : here only; [Orph.] A. 313 π. ταῦρον /.

424

δηδάμενοι καθύπερθεν echoes the pattern of A.R. 1.369 (supr.), but the language

is closer to [Opp.] Cyn. 4.155 / 6φίγξάμενοι καθύπερθεν, Opp. Hal. 3.534, 536 ἀναψάμενοι καθύπερθε /.../ δῆξαν. For δῆξάμενοι cf. Θ 25-6 / βειρήν.../ δῆξάμην, Triph. 306 / δῆξάμενοι βειρήειν sc. ἵππον. ἑθλοῦς ἑπειός : ἑθλοῦς with proper name is rare in archaic epic (cf. here ἑθλοῦς Ὀδυσσεύς / β 71+2, an 'open' version of δῖος Ὀδ. [cf. W. Whallon, Formula, Character and Context, Cambridge Mass. 1969, 112]; ~ δῖος ἑπειός /: 151n.), though it is not uncommon in lyric (Ibyc. SLG 151.22(?); Pi. N. 2.21, I. 5.41; Bacch. 5.129; also Carm. Conv. PMG 894.4, of Diomedes [but see Merkelbach in Dahlmann-Merkelbach, Studien zu Textgeschichte u. Textkritik, Köln 1959, 168]) and in tragedy (A. Pers. 31, 321, 776; E. Heracl. 936). Q. applies it often to females (Deidameia, Penthesileia; Athene).

424-7

ἐὐτρόχα δούρατα is an imprecise expression: a platform furnished with wheels, or a board furnished with rollers? The latter is suggested by φάλαγγες 430 (cf. Follet 181); but Triph. mentions wheels and also thinks of the launching of a ship, see above, and (Vian*) it would be hard to conceive of rollers in this situation. Wheels, which no doubt figured in the Cycle, are referred to by E. Tr. 516 τετραβάμονος.. ἐπ' ἀπύνας (ἀπύνας perhaps indicates a platform too); and they are specifically attributed to Epeius' handiwork, together with a statement to the effect that they would ease the transportation of the Horse (cf. Q. 426f.) both by Dictys (5.11) and by Triph. (100f., ἐλκόμενος 101 ~ Q. 427; cf. 307, 318 ~ Tz. Posth. 640). — In V. (A. 2.235f.) the Trojans themselves fit the wheels (perhaps this is why he makes his Horse comparatively lightweight, if the catalogue of 259f. is really meant to be complete) for the simple reason that a wheeled animal would have made Sinon's story, already gravely implausible in several details, wholly incomprehensible (cf. 187, 192). The argument that these discrepancies between V. and Triph. / Q. prove that 'QS et Triph. ne doivent rien à Virg. ni pour l'épisode de Sinon ni pour celui de l'entrée du cheval' (Vian, Rech. 69) deserves more than the near stony silence it has so far received from supporters of Virgilian influence: for Keydell RE 24.1963.1288 it is simply a case of a sudden (and very convenient) switch to the 'mythographic source', whatever that is.

425

πoσσίν ὑπὸ βριαροῖσιν : cf. Antip. Sid. HE 618 βριαροῖσιν ... ἰχνεῖν, and for the form N19, Hes. Th. 195.

426

ὄφρα ... ἐπηται frame the verse at 428, 691. For the rest cf. iii. 24-5

ἐσπόμενος ἐπὶ ποσσὶν.

427

ἐλκόμενος ... χεῖρες : cf. X 65 / ἐλκόμενος ... ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχαιῶν / ~

Θ 344 Τρώων ὑπὸ χερσὶν / . ὑπὸ χερσὶν also ix. 346. οἱ δ' ἄμα πάντες = i. 743, also Θ 121, hAphr. 73 etc.

428

ῥῆ : for Horse-ship see Austin, A. 2, p. 35. Nautical terminology is employed in this connexion in Virg. A. 2. 236, as elsewhere in descriptions of ^f the Horse's physique (16, 19 ~ 53, 51); so Triph. calls the Horse an ἵππεϊ δέκας (185) and draws on a comparison from ship-building to illustrate one aspect of the Horse's construction at 62f.

429

-ες ἔω δ' ἄλ' ἡχέεσσι = Dion. Bass. F6(b) 4. The corresponding Homeric unit is δ' ἄλ' ἀτρύγετοιο /, but ἀτρύγετος is a 'hard' word. There is a precedent for ἔω δ' ἄλ' (A. R. 1. 357+2; also Dion. Bass. F74r11, and 7x in Q., ἔω δ' ἄλ' ix. 174), but not for δ' ἄλ' ἡχέεσσι. This epithet with words denoting 'sea' is exceedingly rare: in Homer only A 157 θαλάσση .. ἡχέεσσι / (the only other example of nom. θαλάσση + epithet is Π 34 γλαυκῇ, and epithets accompanying other cases are relatively infrequent, Gray, CQ 41, 1947, 109f.); then Leon. Tar. HE 2040 (θαλάσση); A. R. 2. 741 (πόνοιο); orac. in Porph. ap. Eus. PE 6. 3, Parke-Wormell 470. 17 (Ἀμφιτρίτη). Cf. Kost on Musae. 206.

430

επιβαράι is borrowed from A. R. 1. 388 ³επιβαρή, which should not be corrected to bring it into line with our passage: Campbell, RPh 47, 1973, 77. -οὐσι

δ' ἄλ' ἡχέες : -οὐσι (codd.) must have been engendered by a recollection of A. R. 1. 388. It seems unlikely that Q. thought to use a 'simile imperfect' of the type found in A. R. (see Ardizzone, RFIC 84, 1956, 385f.).

431

περιτετριγνῶ :so codd.:for the orthography see Vian on vi.109. It may be reasonable to correct iv.248(~ Ψ 714),vi.109(~ Call.F260.68,Babr.52.2),xiv.265,and perhaps xiv.36;but τρουγ-τρυσ- could well be right in vii.331,xiii.107:cf.Nonn.3.13,12.76;Agath.AP 5.237.3 [Viansino 86],10.14.5 [Vians.38](ctr.Luc.Tim.21).

432

δλιθαινόμενα :Kost on Musae.94-5(p.287). εἰς ἑλὸς ὀϊσμα =Antip.Sid.HE 352;viii.362. ἑλὸς(..)ὀϊσμα appears in a variety of schemes:with εἰς :xiv.345;vii.117;otherwise:xiv.487;v.95;iii.766. First attestations:E.Hec.26 εἰς ὀϊσμα ἑλὸς ,Hel.400 ὀϊσμα ... ἑλὸς . Other examples:with εἰς :D.P.981,Nonn.2.124 [and Περ.20] ;A.R.4.1579,Nonn.26.24;otherwise:Nonn.3.274+2;A.R.1.1014+2,Nonn.4.187. The ἑλμυρὸν ὀϊσμα of archaic epic(hDem.14~Maced.AP 6.30.3)finds echoes in v.337(=orac.ap.D.S.8.21.3,Parke-Wormell 46.4);xiv.551(=Claud.Gig.(2)32). ὀϊσμα :properly 'turbulent,choppy water',but ὀϊσμα had long before Q.'s day been regarded as belonging to a battery of words that could be called upon to serve in the stead of θάλασσα, ἑλ etc.:cf.Doederlein 2.324,Kost on Musae.203.

433

ῥῥῖ πῆμα :in this sedes ii.123,infr.564;in others Λ413~xi.128, Χ288,x.230,xiii.254;Opp.Hal.5.626. πρὶ πτόλιν :236n. ἔργον ἑπειοῦ :157n.

434

πανόδοι μογέοντες :cf.i.631,iii.166 /π. τρομέοντες ;A.R.1.1162 /παγνύειν (which orthography is not found in Q.'s codd.)μογέοντες (ἐφέλκετο,cf.supr.429). For alternative explanations of this adverb in antiquity see Vlacho-dimitris,ZPE 11,1973,66. In Homer(B 12etc.)it certainly means 'with all speed'(Leumann 190),but this is evidently not the meaning in Bacch.13.141f.(see Jebb on [his] 12.141)and A.R.admits two senses(Livrea on 4.859). In Q. on the other hand it appears invariably(18x)to mean δμου πάντες,en masse. See Kost on Musae.44-5. ἑμὶ δ' ἄρ' ἄνθρωποι :358n.

434-5

The decking of the Horse with floral wreaths(ctr.Virg.A.2.248f.delubra deum

....festā velamus fronde), attested in art long before Q.'s day (see Vian here), is mentioned by Triph., 316f., 346 (a detail which prompted Tz. to make a fool of himself, Posth. 700f.): for Triph. 346 → 352f. simile cf. Stesich. SLG 88.11f. 18 $\phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\phi$ [→ 19f. simile.

435

πολλὸν δ' ἔδην : cf. ii. 490, xi. 303, xiv. 25-6. Whether Q. wrote $\delta'\delta\eta\nu$ or $\delta\delta\eta\nu$ (cf. Fraenkel on A. Ag. 828) I do not know. στεφάνων ἐριθηλέα κόμον : so, of floral crowns, Hes. ([Hes.] ?) Th. 576-7 / ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ στεφάνους νεοθηλέας περίθηκε (cf. id. 573, 578, 587), Sapph. PLF 98(a) 8-9 $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha$ [... / $\delta\upsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ (κ) $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\nu$ id. 3), Bacch. 13.69^f. $\pi\alpha\nu\theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$ $\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\nu$ / $\delta\epsilon\nu\theta$] ϵ [ων, Pi. Parthen. 2.48 $\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\eta\theta\epsilon\nu$ etc. κόμον is meticulously arranged decoration: cf. H. Diller in Festschrift B. Snell, Munich 1956, 48f. κόμον ἔθεντο : one might have expected $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ here, as in hHom. 6.14 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\chi\rho\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ / (ctr. = 187 $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota$ $\chi\rho\omicron\iota$ $\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron$ $\kappa\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\nu$ /), the more so with $\delta\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\rho\upsilon\sigma\omicron\nu \sim \epsilon\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota$ in the immediate vicinity. But of course there is no shortage of parallels for middles of this kind (they are especially common in the Hellenistic era): cf. Schwyzer 2.234f.; J.M. Stahl, Kritisch-Historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums..., Hildesheim repr. 1965, 59f.

436

ἀντὶ δ' ἔτεψαντο : Call. Iamb. F194.42 / ἀντὶ τ' ἀνέτεψ[αντο]. ἔτεψαντο κάρη : cf. E. Ba. 313 $\delta\tau\epsilon\phi\acute{\omicron}\nu$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta$; A. R. 4.1158; Nic. F130 ~ xiv. 376-7.

436-7

The Horse is dragged along to the accompaniment of loud shouting in Triph. 350f. → Stesich., and cf. E. Tr. 521, conclamant in Virg. A. 2.233. However, the wording here is extremely awkward (unlike vi. 337-8, quoted by Vian: $\delta\upsilon\nu\tau\eta$ δ' $\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ $\lambda\alpha\omega\tilde{\nu}$ / $\delta\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\omega\nu$, cf. A. R. 1.310-11, Nonn. 39.131-2; vi. 528-9 is in no way comparable), and Struve's $\delta\eta\pi\upsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ $\delta\upsilon\lambda\omicron\sigma\iota$ is attractive. Flutes figure in the picture drawn by Triph. 308f. ~ Tz. Posth. 699. Q., it is true, mentions flutes later in connexion with Trojan festivities, so adopting a sequence identical to that of E. Tr. 542f. flutes-singing-dancing (xiii. 1f.); but so does Triph. in his sequel (501). — Vian* argues that

the combination 'flute-playing/men shouting' would be odd, and that Q. is concerned only with men in 433-7 (cf. 439f.). But the syntax of the paradosis is surely unacceptable. μέγα δ' ἦπνε : cf. ε 399 μεγάλ' ἦπνε, Scut. 316 (-υον); for λαὸς Σ 502 / λαὸν δ' .. ἐπ' ἦπυσον; for conj. αὖλο' xiii.2 / αὖλο' ... μέγ' ἦπυσον, Mosch. Eur. 97-8 αὖλον ἀνιπύοντος. ἀλλήλοισ ἐπ' ἐκκεκλωμένων : see above, and Θ 346, Ο 368 / ἀλλήλοισι τε κεκλωμένοι.

437-8

Enyo reappears at the time of the Greek offensive in xiii.85, cf. Triph. 559f. Tz. (Posth. 716) has χαῖρε δ' ἔνύω / at a slightly later stage, when the Horse has been admitted and the Trojans have taken to sacrificing and drinking. For the expression cf. Λ 73 Ἔρις ... χαῖρε .. εἰς ὁρῶσα /. The picture of allegorical figures indulging their malicious joy is widespread in Q., as it is in Nonnos and in Roman epic: particularly striking is xi.151-2 (~ Nonn. 2.419-20) κεχάροντο ἐν Κῆρες ἐγέλασσε δ' Ἀρης, ῥάχῃ δ' ἔνύω /; Enyo: viii.289, 425; Eris: ii.460, viii.191 ~ ix.324, xi.161; Keres: viii.11-12, 324-5 (+Moros), ix.145-6, xiii.126. For γέλων in such contexts cf. Nonn. 7.181, 16.264.

438

πολέμοιο κακὸν τέλος : cf. ω 124 θανάτοιο κακὸν τέλος, xiv.117 πολέμοιο μακρὸν τέλος. The Homeric 'τέλος of war/battle', variable in meaning (and disputed: Holwerda, Mnemosyne 16, 1963, 338, 358; Ambrose, Glotta 43, 1965, 52) occurs in only these two places in Q. It is not particularly common in verse elsewhere: (i) Υ 101 πολέμου τέλος = Nonn. 25.363, cf. Triph. 525, A.R. 4.1281-2. (ii) (a) Γ 291 τέλος πολέμοιο = Or. Sib. 3.807, Nonn. 36.415, cf. Hes. Th. 638. (b) Π 630 τέλος πολέμου.

438-9

As expected, the inveterate foes of Troy (Υ 313f., D.P. 818 etc.) are on the scene to indulge their glee (they do more than that in Triph. 331^f, 337f.), as they are later at the sack (xiii.417-8, cf. Virg. A. 2.612f., which reads like a description of a picture, and Triph. 566f.). For the language cf. xiv.546-7 ἡ δ' ἐψόθεν εἰς ὁρῶσα / τέρπεθ' ... Τριτογένεια /, Nonn. 42.541-2 κεχάρητο

Κρονίων /... ὕψι δοκούνων /; Ov. Ars 1.633, Fast. 5.691; V. Fl. 6.209-10.

439

ἔπεγν' ἰθεὺν : 148n.

439-40

οἱ δὲ μολόντες /... ποτὶ : cf. Z 286 ἡ δὲ μολούσα ποτὶ...

440

ἄβ' οὐ ποτὶ βέτερον : P 287, 419, Zen. at Σ 210; cf. 65supr. μεγάλης ..

πόλῃος : in archaic epic only τ 178 μεγάλη πόλῃς, and not as common as one might have expected thereafter: see Bissinger 138, but add [Scymn.] 338, Or. Sib.

4.82+7, Gr. Naz. 1261.98. I am not sure that Bissinger (139) is right in his contention that μεγάλης here is meant 'einfach räumlich'. Presumably μέγας could be as hazy for a Greek as 'great' can be for us: cf. μέγα πτολίεθρον in xiv. 118; Bowra, op. cit. (on 377), 4f., on ἄβ' οὐ μέγα in Homer.

440-1

κρηδεμνα πόλῃος / λυόμενοι : cf. hDem. 151 κ. πόλῃος /; Bacch. F20(B) 11 πολίων

κράδεμνα λύει after Π 100 Τροίης .. κ. λύωμεν / ('The city is perhaps compared to a captive woman whose veil is torn off by her captor', H.L.

Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments, London 1950, 386), v 388 Τροίης λύωμεν ..

κ. / vi. 45 Τροίης κ. & For a related field of imagery see West on Hes. Th.

978. — This is a common ingredient in the story from Il. Parv. on, see Vian, adding Stat. Silv. 1.1.11. (κρηδεμνα may be meant to carry sinister undertones in Triph. 347, cf. Knight 133). One would like to know the source of the engaging tale recorded by schol. δ 246: Odysseus penetrated Troy in disguise in order to measure the gates for the Horse. Triph. (338f.) treads a path of his own.

441

λυγρὸν ἄππον : so 571 infr., cf. vi. 245-7 λυγραί /... Διομηδεὸς ἄπποι / ἀνδροβόροι (for the feminine there see Lobel, Poxy. 26, 1961, p. 149).

αἰ δ' ὀλόλυξαν : the same clausula in γ 450 (ἰβέν ... cf. λυόμενοι Q.), hAp. 445, A.R. 3.1218. Q. may have in his head (see 443 infr.) χ 408... ὀλολύξαι, ἔπει μέγα εἶδεν ἔργον /. The verb strikes a sinister note ('cry of exultation ... re bene gesta', Fraenkel on A. Ag. 1236); cf. also (Vian*) Deubner, APAW 1941.1,

J. Rudhardt, Notions fondamentales, Geneva 1958, 178f.

441-3

The Trojan women appear on the scene at this point in Triph. also (340f.), though they do more than stand gazing in awe. This traditional picture (we get a fleeting glimpse of it in E. Tr. 521f., the barest bones in [Apolod.] 5.16) is set in the context of Roman religious ceremonial by Virg. (A. 2.238f., cf. Austin, JRS 49, 1959, 21f.). [Triph.'s version, often alleged to be 'Virgilian', is, despite 341 ~ A. 2.238, which after all do not have the same point of reference, akin rather to that of Dictys 5.11 (fin.: 'women and men...', cf. Triph. 350)].

442

περιβιβάσων : 361-2n.

442-3

πᾶσαι ... / θάμβειν : cf. hAp. 134-5 αἰετ' ἀρ' πᾶσαι / θάμβειν. εἰσορόωσαι / θάμβειν : so, with partic. first, xiv. 552-3 ~ [Orph.] A. 237. Ctr.: -ix. 236 / θάμβει δ' εἰσορόων ~ Nonn. 48.654 (-όωσαι), A.R. 4.1192 / θάμβειν δ' -όωσαι [Orph.] A. 1218-9 πάντες / θάμβειν -όντες; vi. 156, 173 εἰθάμβειν (-ον) -όωσαι (-όντες), A.R. 1.550-1 εἰθάμβειν -όωσαι / ἔργον...

443

θάμβειν ὄβριμον ἔργον : cf. A.R. just cited, and vi. 236 (ἄμφι δὲ ..) / θάμβειν ἄπειτον ἔργον. Virg. has (A. 2.32-3) molem mirantur equi... hortatur (cf. ἐποτρύνων 444): we are clearly dealing with traditional patterns.

ὄβριμον ἔργον : Anon. (Antim.? Turner, JHS 73, 1953, 165) ap. Schubart, Gr. Lit. Pap. 6.29 (Tyr. IEG 11.27 ὄβριμα ἔργα). Triph. calls the Horse ὄβριμος at 384.

ἔργον οἴδη : so Platt (128): δὲ' codd. This unit occurs B 436, and note A.R. 2.137-8 ὡς ἐνόησαν οἱ δὲ σφικιν ἐγγύθεν ἄλλο / πημ' ἄλγος ἐν.

ἔκρυψε πῆμα : cf. 545. The form ἔκρυψε had already made an appearance in epigram (Gow-Page on Antip. Sid. HE 366); it and compounds 7x Q., 21x Nonn.,

ἔκρυφον [not -εν: Keydell, BZ 54, 1961, 287] [Apolin.] 39.30.

444-499

Laocoon: cont. See on 389-417.

444

ἐποτρύνων ἐταροῖσιν = ix.274; ctr. β 422a1. ἐταροῖσιν ἐποτρύνας (-ὄναι).

445

ἵππον ἀμαλδύνα :supr.170. μαλερώ πυρί :cf.568n., and γ 316, Φ 375; Gr.Naz. 1354.5. On μ.πῦρ see Graz 126f.

445-6

τοῖ .../πείθοντ' :similarly B 833-4= Λ 331-2 τῷ δέ σ' οὔτι / πείθεσθην, π 279-80 σ' δέ τοι οὔτι / πείθονταί, xiv.364 / σ' δέ σ' οὔτι πείθοιτο. All are followed by γάρ, all refer to doomed individuals.

446

ὑποτρομέεσκον ὁμοκλήν :214n.

447-8

'On top of this <the blinding> Athene set in motion something <even> more horrendous, <directed> against the sons'. Virg. A.2.199-200 (~ Petr.29) hic aliud maius miseris multoque tremendum/obicitur magis... While it is true that aliud figures often in announcements of some fresh calamity (see Austin on A.2, loc.cit.) and that Q.'s language bears more than a passing resemblance to such Roman sequences as V.Fl.2.209-10 hic aliud Venus et multo magis ipsa tremendum/orsa nefas..., Stat.Theb.4.377-8 novus his super anxia turbat/corda metus, Sil.10.415 etc., a key passage here—and an Alexandrine one—is A.R. 1.1064-5 (the husband was killed: the wife) κακῶ δ' ἐπὶ κύντερον ἄλλο / ἤνυσεν, a passage utilised once more in xiv.625-6 κακῶ δ' ἐπὶ κύντερον ἄλλος [cf. xiv.272; A.R.3.514] / τλήσαν; cf. Θ 483, η 216 (ἐπὶ ..) κύντερον ἄλλο /, λ 427, υ 18 κύντερον ἄλλο υ-κ. For the heralding of the portent here cf. in general A.R.4.1364 ἐνθα τὸ μῆκιστον τερῶν Μινύησιν ἐτύχθη, which Arend(148) sees as a mid-way stage between the plain B 308 ἐνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα γῆμα and the highly charged and emotive hic aliud maius etc. of Virg.

447

τῶ δ' ἐπὶ : H 163, viii.293 etc. θεὸς... Ἀθήνη : see on 153 and 154.

448

δουτέωνοις τεκέεσσι :cf.463infr., E.Andr.1038 δουτέωνων τεκῶν. The children are miseros in Petr.47:ctr.Virg.A.2.215 miseros/ārtus. ἐμῆδετο : 'was

contriving', 'putting into operation'; cf. Fränkel 51, 54. (West on Hes. Op. 49 curiously denies the imperfect such a nuance).

449f.

A scene full of vocabulary familiar in the description of portents: e.g.

451 $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\rho\delta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omicron\iota$, 455 $\alpha\iota\psi\alpha \sim$ 461, 470 $\lambda\phi\alpha\rho$, 464 ($\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$) $\pi\epsilon\lambda\omega\rho\alpha$, 466 $\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha$;

on these consult H. Stockinger, Die Vorzeichen im homerischen Epos, Oberbayern 1959, 158f.

449-53

It is interesting that Petronius' account begins with what seems to hold out the promise of a formal ecphrasis (29f. celsa qua Tenedos mare...), even if it turns out not to be such in the end (cf. Stubbe 44).

449-50

These lines resemble Hes. Th. 301-2 $\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha \delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$ (Echidna) $\sigma\pi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\iota \kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omega$ $\kappa\sigma\iota\lambda\eta \delta\upsilon\pi\omicron \pi\epsilon\epsilon\tau\rho\eta / \tau\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon \lambda\pi' \lambda\theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omega\nu \tau\epsilon \theta\epsilon\omega\nu \theta\eta\tau\omega\nu \tau' \lambda\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$; but they have more in common with the glassy smoothness of the Alexandrine-flavoured $\epsilon\kappa\phi\rho\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in Ov. Fast. 4.495-6 est specus.../non homini regio, non adeunda ferae (cf. also the snake's cave of Met. 3.29f., and in general C.P. Segal, Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Hermes Einzelschr. 23, 1969, 20f.).

449

$\delta\eta \gamma\alpha\rho \pi\omicron\upsilon$ = A.R. 1.996, cf. id. 4.197; xiv.341. For $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ ('so we are told'; cf. infr. 468, 'no doubt', ii.290 'presumably', 'must have', ix.182 [strongly impressionistic]), affected by A.R., see Fränkel 124. $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu \lambda\iota\tau\rho\omicron\nu$...: cf. xiv.475 $\lambda\iota\tau\rho\alpha \pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota \sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\eta\epsilon\iota\nu$ (corr.).. $\lambda\mu\phi\iota \pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\varsigma / \dots$ $\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\omega\delta\epsilon\iota \pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$: 409n. This epithet here only; on $\omega\delta\eta\varsigma$ see Schneider, Call. 2.455.

450

$\eta\epsilon\rho\omicron\epsilon\nu$: an epithet of $\lambda\iota\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ thrice in hHerm. (234 $\lambda\iota\tau\rho\omicron\nu \dots \omicron\epsilon\nu$; 172 = 359 = [Orph.] H. 69.4). What $\eta\epsilon\rho\omicron\epsilon\nu$ denotes for Q. it is hard to say: dark, impervious to sunlight (cf. Virg. A. 8.195; Sil. 6.150, a snake's lair) or misty, vaporous (both in Ov. Met. 11.592f.)? $\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\nu \lambda\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$: cf. Eratosth. CA 16.14 (corr.) $\lambda\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\iota \lambda\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu /$. This epithet (again at viii.484) is somewhat affected by late poets (Opp. Hal. 2.526, Nonn. Met. 3.66, 7.139, D. 2.140⁴).

+3, Paul. Sil. Ephr. Soph. 1005, 1021), particularly by epigrammatists (Agath. AP 4.4.28 [Viansino 2], 5.294.3 [V.90], 9.641.5 [V.44], Paul. Sil. AP 5.234.3 [V.49]; cf. earlier Antip. Sid. HE 642, Anon. id. 3886, Apollonid. GPh 1255).

450-1

θηρες / εμερδαλέοι : cf. viii.175-6. They are εμερδαλέοι, like their father, Opp. Hal. 3.19.

451

ε'τ' : other such creatures may be dead, but these are still very much alive. A.R. takes rather longer to make a similar point about a monster from the hazy past in 4.1641f.

451-2

οὐλομένοιο .. / Τυφῶνος : οὐλ. here = οὐλος (see Fränkel 107-8), cf. A.R. 2.38 οὐλοῦτο Τυφῶεος. For other uncomplimentary epithets lavished upon this creature see J. Fontenrose, Python, Berkely & Los Angeles 1959, 83. He produced a variety of monsters (cf. vi.261-2), including the hydra that Hera later sent to destroy Heracles (Hes. Th. 313f.); to Echidna, πέλωρον ὄφιν σεῖνον ... [299] who herself apparently resided in a cave [301f.]. On Typhon's own caves see Vian on Nonn. 1.140.

452

νήβοιο κατὰ πύχας : Nicandrian in both form and content: Ther. 804 Κίβοιο κατὰ πύχας, 458 ἐν πτυχὶ νήβου /. πύχας = μυχούς (see in general Kannicht on E. Hel. 44-8), i.e. 'creek' (Vian). Καλύδνην : cf. vii.406-7 ~ B 677. For this place of origin see Bacch. F9; POxy. 2812 (above), and cf. Lyc. 347 (with Tz.), [Apollod.] 5.18. Virgil makes them emerge from Tenedos (which houses the Greek armada at this moment), and he is followed by Petr. 29, Hyg. 135.

452-3

ἦν τε ἐπικλείουσιν : cf. = 290-1 ἦν τ' κικλήσκουσι θεοί, and Ruijgh, TE 385.

453

λαός : 'people' in general, as e.g. A. Supp. 90 μερόπееεε λαός = ἄνθρωποις ; cf. ἄνδρες in Arat. 92, φῶτες in D.P. 1151, φῶλ' ἄνθρωπων in iv.10 etc., and

Simm. CAS 8' ρ'.... Ἰατὲ κικλήσκουσιν/. ἐπικλείουσιν : 'call' (also iv.10-11 τὸν .. φύλ' ἀνθρώπων / Γλαῦκον ἐπικλείουσιν), first in Alexandrine verse: Arat. 92, A.R. 2.1156, 4.571, 1599, Nic. Ther. 230, 554, Alex. 346; also, apparently, in the Hellenistic hexam., variously ascribed to Philitas and Euphoriion, see Carden, BICS 16, 1969, 31, verse 22. Later examples are scarce: Androm. GDK 62.3, D.P. 1151, Opp. Hal. 1.157, corr. in Colluth. 90. ἔω ἄλός : 429n. Probably with νήσοιο rather than (Vian) with ἄντρον : for 'an island in the sea' cf. the common εἰν ἄλὶ νῆς(ος) , and, e.g., Lyr. Adesp. CA 10.3-4 γλαυκῆς .. πέλ[ας] / Δοκρίφες ἄκται.

454

ἐνθεν ἀναστρέφεται : cf. \int 7-Gr. Naz. 985.197 / ἐνθεν ἀναστρέφας ; Colluth. 50 Τητῆνας ἀναστρέφεται sc. ἔρις . βίην .. δρακόντων : with this periphrasis one may compare (perhaps) A. Eu. 128 δρακαίνης .. μένος.

455

ἐς Τροίην : iii.530 etc.; also Λ 22al., Hes. Op. 165, Triph. 26. οἷ δ' αἰψα = ix.526, x.64. θεῆς : 112n.

456

νήσον ὄλην ἐτίναξαν : cf. for the form iii.159, and for the content v.643 ὄλη ... νήσος /, A.R. 2.679-80 ἡ δ' ὅπ' οὐ ποσειδὶν / σείετο νήσος ὄλη , Nonn. 18.37 / νήσον ὄλην ; id. 28.73 ὄλην ἐτίναξαν ἀπηήν /, 45.326; [Apolin.] 59.3 / γαῖαν ὄλην ἐδόνησας . Any reading other than ὄλην is out of the question. ἐπεμαρμάγηε δὲ πόντος : 176n. Noise in Virg. too (A. 2.209 fit sonitus spumante salo cf. Petr. 38, 40), but monsters are noisy things: e.g. E. Hipp. 1210f.; Ov. Met. 4.688f.

457

νέομενων : cf. Hes. Th. (70-)71, and for the spelling, 217n. The subject is more often than not omitted in contexts of this kind: Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 115, p.158. τοὶ δ' ἐφέρωντο : see iii.589 (below), and xiii.61 αἷ δ' ἐφέρωντο / ~ κ 54 ($\frac{2}{\dots}$).

457-8

Strongly Homeric language, N 29-30 (Poseidon riding over the sea: ἄταλλε δὲ

κῆτε' 27;/ ἔβτι δέ τι σπέος ... 32 ~ supr. 449) θάλασσα δειβτατο' τοὶ δὲ
πέτοντο / ῥίμφα ... [ix. 216-7] ~ iii. 588f. (Nereids) ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἔφει /
νιόμηναι θάλασσα δειβτατο' καὶ δ' ἐφέροντο / περιτενέχοντο δὲ .. /
κῆτεα .., ἔβαν δ' ἄφαρ ἤχι νέοντο / ...; cf. also Σ 66f., Ω 96, and Ov. Fast.

6.740. Petr. (31) has unda..resultat scissa, though one wonders whether at this point Eumolpus is trying to disentangle himself from a formal ecphrasis (449-53n.); whether, in fact, he has the picture of a creek (πτύχας Q. 452) in his head (cf. Virg. A. 1.159f. est in secessu..locus....inque sinus scindit sese unda reductos). — No sign in Q. of the Virgilian detail tranquilla per alta (A. 2.203), on which see McKay, CQ n.s. 17, 1967, 188.

458

ἀνὸν λιχμῶντες: so the snake-heads of their father are described as λελιχμότες in Hes. Th. 826, where see West for the notion of flickering tongues. Q. has already used this phrase at v. 40, cf. vi. 213 — ὥωκα, id. 200.

κῆτεα ποίντων: an identical clausula in Marc. Sid. GDK 63.40. We do not know the context of Call. Fr. Anon. 112 Schneider, κῆτα πεφρίκαβιν, τὰ τέ εφίβιν ἀντιόωβιν (Schneider: 'Lege κῆτεα πεφρίκαβι et intellige de animalibus, quae deos appropinquantes horrent'). Κῆτεα are themselves in the habit of striking terror into other marine life: iii. 270f. ~ Φ 22f. cf. Stat. Theb. 9.242f.;

Dirae 5.

459

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' α ...: cf. ϵ 41 / ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' α ... ἡγερέθοντο /, vi. 227al.; Nonn. 37.39 / ἀμφὶ δέ μιν στενέχοντες. στενέχοντο μέγα: μέγα (Hom. μεγάλα cf. ii. 221 etc.) στενέχειν occurs in EpGr. 289.3 Kaibel (Caria, ip?); [Opp.] Cyn. 1.225; ii. 581al.; μέγα with med. only here. μέγα often follows the verb in Q. (e.g. ii. 287, 534, iii. 297), as it does in archaic epic (West on Hes. Th. 173). μέγα Ξ ἀνθαιον — x = M 313.

459-60

Cf. A.R. 2.711 νύμφαι, πλειστοῖο θυγάτρεις, and iii. 23-4 ρέεθρα / Ξ ἀνθον καὶ Σιμόεντος. These rare beings (Colluth. 1 Νύμφαι Τρωιάδες, ποταμοῦ Ξ ἀνθου γενέθλη; viii. 345-6 Νυμφῶν sc. Ξ ἀνθον?) lament Trojan losses at xi. 245-6 ἐπεστενέχοντο δὲ Νύμφαι / καλλιρόου Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ Ξ ἀνθου θυγάτρεις

[~ Z 4 vulg. Σίμ. ἰδὲ Ξ. ῥοδῶν], as at the fall of Troy / Ξάνθος ... /
 μύρετο ἐν Νύμφῃν (xiv.72-3) along with Simois(83), cf. Xanthus and Simois
 in Triph. 325f., Xanthus in id. 683f. Our passage could conceivably reflect an
 Alexandrine adaptation of a tragic messenger-speech (these rivers are often
 animate or near-animate in tragedy, cf. S. Aj. 417f., 862f., E. Tr. 28f., 1115f.).
 See in general Kost, Musae. p. 175; V. Mumprecht, Epitaphios Bionos, Zürich 1964,
 59, 63-4.

460

ἀπ' οὐλύμπου : in this sedes hAp. 216; A. R. 4. 770; i. 690a1. Κυπρίς : see on
 389-417, § 4. Cases of divine sympathy in Q. are discussed by A. Paul, Die
Barmherzigkeit der Götter im griechischen Epos, Diss. Wien 1969, 134f.

461

ὅπη θεὸς [~ iii. 776] ὀτρύνεκεν : cf. xiii. 187 θεὸν ὀτρύνοντος /, xiv. 657
 ἱκάνει, ὅπη θεὸς ἦγεν.

462

θίγοντες ... λοιγὸν ὀδόντων : an adaptation of phraseology habitually applied
 to boar(s) : Λ 416 θίγων λευκὸν ὀδόντα [cf. Nic. Alex. 223, and Scut. 388] μετὰ
 γναμπῆσι γένυεσσι, N 474-5-A. R. 3. 1351-2 ὀδόντας / θίγει, and so Q. himself
 at v. 20-1 ὑπὸ βλοσυρῆσι γένυεσσι / θίγοντες ... ὀδόντας /, ix. 244 / θίγει δ'
 ... ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσιν ὀδόντας /. βλοσυρῆσι will mean something like 'feroc-
 ious' or 'deadly'; a useful survey of this word (which Q. employs frequently)
 in Leumann, 141f. βλοσυρῆσι γενεαῖσι : for the form cf. H 212 βλοσυροῖσι
 προβάται (Theoc. 24. 118 ~ iii. 539) and Nonn. 40. 307 χαροπῆσι γενεαῖσι, for
 the expression vi. 200 βλοσυρῆσι γενεαῖσι λιχμῶντες / sc. φράκοντες; with
 γένυεσσι / γενέεσσι i. 479 (πόρδαλις), ii. 576 (εὐς, λέων), v. 20 (εὐς); vi. 210
 (λέων); iii. 146, vii. 471 (id.), cf. Nonn. 11. 340 (λέοντες), 12. 321 (φράκων);
 with γένει(ον) : [Orph.] A. 994 (φράκων), Nonn. 2. 286 (ἄρκτος). λοιγὸν
ὀδόντων : λοιγόν is adjectival in Nic. Ther. 6 λοιγὸν ὀδόντα / (the variant
λοιγὸν [: λυγρὸν] ὀϊστόν may well be correct at iii. 83, cf. Vian ad loc.).

463

δυστηνοῖς ἐπὶ παῖσι : cf. supr. 448, and GVI 1593.2 (pentam.; Athens, iip) ἐπὶ

δυστήνοις παλιό(ι) ; A.R.4.448 / δυσ(μενέων) ἐπὶ παλιό(ι) . ἐπενίδατο
codd., ἐπενίβετο Vian. The paradosis offers νίβ(6)αντο at iii.786, M has
 παρηνίδατο in hAp.430, and (Erbse 567) codd. Athen. κίτενίδατο in Hermesian.
 CA 7.65—but there is no knowing really whether we are dealing with scribal
 artifice/sloppiness or genuine rarities. For the acc.pers. cf. A.R.4.817.

φύσῃ : 'impulse to flee panic-stricken', as in §268f., p 437f. ἐν δὲ Ζεὺς
 .. / φύσαν ἐμοῖς ἐτάρσι κακὴν βάλαν, οὐδέ τις ἐτλη / μείναι (6τῆναι p 439)
 .. περὶ γὰρ ... (cf. Gruber 29f.). One may again compare Nic.: Ther. 399f. / οὐκ
 μίμνουσιν (sc. snake) φύσῃ δὲ ...

464

αἰνὰ πτόλιν : common in Q. as in Homer and others; cf. Θ 55 / Τρώες ... αἰνὰ
 πτόλιν, adapted in iii.50; supr. 353n. αἰνὰ πέλωρα : κ 219 (sim. Call. Dian. 51)
 τοὶ δ' ἔδειξαν, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἰνὰ πέλωρα /, the claus. α. π. also Cypr. F24.1,
 A.R.1.996. In Theoc. 24.13 αἰνὰ π. (≡ ...) = δράκοντες, cf. Eudoc. Cypr. 1.66
 / αἰνοπέλωρον ὄφιν.

465-6

οὐδέ τις ... / μείναι ἐτλη : cf. A 534-5 and on 463 above; Σ 246-7 οὐδέ τις
 ἐτλη / ἔσθθαι, πάντας γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος. For the sequence οὐδέ ... δειμα §
 cf. iv.482-3; 'Simon.' HE 3310f. / οὐδ' ἐτλη ... / μείναι ... δ' ... / δειμάς ...

465

οὐδ' ... ἦεν : based no doubt on the famous V 371-2 καὶ εἰ' μένος ..
 αἰθωνι σιδηρῇ / sc. ἔοικεν; ἄτρομος appears in the reflection of the Homeric
 epanalepsis at iii.74-5 / οὐδ' εἰ' ... μά' ἄτρομον ἦτορ ἔχῃσιν, / ἄτρομον
 ἦτορ ἔχῃσιν ... Stru^Yke's πάρος for μένος, which has enjoyed some success
 (cf. Vian, Rech. 153), is silly. μένος ἄτρομος : but E 125-6, P 156-7 μένος
 ... / ἄτρομον (cf. supr. 77 ἄτρομος ἀλκή / ~ A.R.3.1256-7 ἀλκή / ... ἄτρομος).
 Accus. μένος with α-privative is common enough, e.g. A 270 μένος .. ἄτρης /.
ἄτρομος : of a person (Q. 5x; LSJ know nothing of this usage) first apparently
 in Lyc.1003, then Mosch. Eur. 143 (of the θεόταυρος; preferable to the v.l.
 ἄβροχος); widespread in post¹-Alexandrine verse (particularly Nonn.; late
 epigrammatists in AP, cf. also SEG 3.553 [Thrace, v]).

466

πάντας ... δειμα : a similar pattern in iii.6 πάντας γὰρ ἀμείλιχον ἔμπεχε
πένθος /(after L 708), cf. vii.529 (πάντας γὰρ .. δέος), ix.273 (δέος ἔμπεχε)
ἔμπεχε δειμα /also vii.250, xiii.190.

467

ἀλενομένους : 68n. ὀδύνη δ' ἔχεν : this is a much-vexed phrase (see Zimmermann
 for some hideous attempts at correction), but it is, I believe, sound enough.

'Fear' and 'grief' (anxiety for the fate of the son) are reactions to the
 snake-attack in Pi. N. 1.48f. δέος ~ 53 Amphitryon ὀξείας ἀνδρῶν τυπείς.

The 'grief' here may be for those near and dear to them, or for Laocoon and
 his sons (cf. 463). For the expression cf. Lyr. Adesp. CA 1.3 ὀδύνη μ' ἔχει.

ἐνθα γυναῖκες : ἐνθα = 'at this point': the females occupy a detached tabloid;
 no need for ἐν δὲ (Koechly). The sense of ἐνθα is variable in this clausula:
hDem. 126, D. P. 570, xi.492; also 2 ... hDem. 115.

467-9

A similar idea in xiii.453f.

468

καὶ πού τις : this Homeric unit (σ 382), beloved of Oppian (Hal. 1.308+4)
 appears occasionally elsewhere: Arat. 941, Call. F260.66, A. R. 4.1457, Gr. Naz.
 1456.69; again in Q. at xiii.155. For πou see on 449.

469

ἀλενομένης τυχερὸν μόρον : see 68n., and i.21, vii.127. This epithet-noun
 combination is found in Hes. Th. 211, [poorly supported v.1. E 47], Gr. Naz.
 1015.606; with noun first: Opp. Hal. 5.229.

469-70

ἄμφι ἐπεβυμένῃ : ctr. ii.200-1 (army on march) ἄμφι δὲ γὰρ (corr.:
δ' ἔλγυι ἀ-αί) / εἰτεῖν ἐπεβυμένων. εἴτεν could refer to grief (cf.
 467-8, and A. Ag. 710f., E. Cyc. 198f.) but it is more likely to mean that the city
 in its entirety (ἄμφι) groaned under their weight (cf. 456a): Stat. Theb. 5.525
 (serpens) arva gementia radens.

470

ἐπεβυμένων : so Nonn. 6.117-8 ἐπεβυμένων ... φρακόντων / εἰς ἐν ἰόντες :

471

περιδρῦφθαλαν : this hapax Hom. (Ψ 395) finds a close imitation in iv.540.

ἐνετείνοντο δ' ἄλγυιαίς : cf. ix.179 - θῆκαν, ἐν. δὲ νεκροί / sc. Ἐάνθω; and Triph. 543 (the sack) ἐστείνετο δ' Ἴλιος ἱρή /, which could well be a reference to Φ 607, on which see Wyss on Antim. F137 (and id., p. xxx).

472

ἀμφιπεριπτῶλλοντες : similarly Opp. Hal. 1.190 / ἀμφιπερικαίροντες = Nonn. 18.53 (corr.); other participles: [Orph.] L. 80, Nonn. 48.338, Paul. Sil. Amb. 134, 268; main verb: iii.201 and Call. Del. 179, Opp. Hal. 4.54, Agath. AP 5.237.3 [Viansino 86]; infin.: xiii.11. — This compound, needless to say, here only; περιπτῶλλω too is rare: Kost on Musae. 206. ἐλλειπτο : A.R. thrice uses this form (1.45, 824, 4.1244). It is presumably founded on athematic aorists like ἐΐλεκτο, ἐΐλεκτο (cf. Schwyzer 1.678f.); lovers of speculation may be attracted by the contentions of G. Marxer, Die Sprache des Ap. Rhod. in ihren Beziehungen zu Homer, Diss. Zürich 1935, 15 (v.1. κλισίῃφιν ἐλλειπτο at N 168 κλισίῃφι ἐλέλειπτο ?); Griffiths, JHS 88, 1968, 173 (v.1. ἐνέλειπτο for ἐλέλειπτο at B 700, cl. A.R. 1.45?). We find ἄνταπλάμειπτο in Call. (PAⁿ t. 113, F1(a)8), ἀμειπτο (ἀπ-μετ³) in Nonn. (cf. Keydell, Proleg. 53); ἀπάμειπτο Eudoc. Cyprr. passim, and AP 14.4.2.

ἄπρωθε : 293n.

473

ἀναπαίσι : cf. i.434, x.384, xiv.32.

473-4

πέδησε θεός : along the lines of X 5 / ἔκτορα δ' ... ὁλοῖν μοῖρα πέδησεν /, T 94 πέδησε / sc. Ἄτη ὀλομένη, al.; cf. iv.200-1 Τεύκροιο μένος καὶ γυνὴ πέδησαν [v N 435] / ἄθανάτοισι. [The v.1. at Δ 517 κῆρ (ἐ)πέδησε / (: μοῖρα π.) has very poor authority]. ὀλομένη Κῆρ : vi.427, ix.190, x.449 (/ καὶ Κύπρις) ~ A.R. 4.1485 ὀλόμεναι ... Κῆρες. Cf. Σ 535, Scut. 156 ὁλοῖν Κῆρ / (adapted in ii.482-3). Κῆρ / καὶ θεός : ctr. T 410 θεός ... καὶ Μοῖρα.

474

υἱας υποτρομέοντας ὀλέθρον: A.R. 2.1106-7 τρομέοντες ὀλέθρον / υἱήες.

475

Q. must have had before him (unless the theft had already been committed in his Hellenistic source) A.R. 4.155 (dragon) ἀμφοτέρους δλοῖναι περιπτύξαι γένυ' ἐββιν. We have had to wait till now to be told that there are two sons, just as we have to wait till 480 to be told that there are two snakes.

ἀηρείψαντο: the form one would expect is ἀηρέψαντο (Cauer, 110, thinks that there was confusion with ἐρείπειν; cf. also Rank 39-40, with bibliogr.), but ἀηρείψαντο is the form attested for Homer (5x) and for Q. (6x). West on Hes. Th. 990 gives a list of attestations, with variants (A.R. 1.214 -έψατο now Π¹), to which may be added EpGr. 874.7 Kaibel (Sparta, ii-iii), 1046.14 (Rome, ii), both -ηρείψαντο.

476

πατρὶ φίλῳ = A 441 etc. ὀρέγοντας.. χείρας: in appeal e.g. xiv. 437 ὀρέγουσιν .. εἰς ἐμὲ χείρας /, A 351 μητρὶ φίλῃ ἡρῆδατο χείρας ὀρεγνύς /, μ 257 (companions of Odysseus being devoured by Scylla; quoted by Koechly) / χείρας ἐμοὶ ὀρέγοντας (cf. id. 244 ~ supr. 474). Petr. has this detail (44f., parvulas illi manus/ad ora referunt), Virg. does not.

476-7

φίλῳ ... / ἐΐθενεν: cf. Mosch. Eur. 111-12, and the passages adduced by Bühler, pp. 153-4. οὐδ' ... / ἐΐθενεν: similarly viii. 114-5 οὐδ' ἐπαμύνειν / ἐΐθενεν, xiv. 97-8 / ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν ... ἀμύνειν / ἐΐθενον. Laocoon in Virg. is like a Heracles and puts up a fierce struggle. Petr. is like Q. in representing him as an infirmus auxiliator (49), but unlike Q. he has not represented him as blinded, and seems to regard him as somewhat decrepit (cf. 23) and noisy (19f.).

477

ἀμφὶ δὲ Τρῶες: elsewhere confined to i-ii: i. 173, and claus. i. 53+4.

ἀπόπροθεν εἰσορόωντες: xiii. 478-9 ἀπόπροθεν ... / εἰσορόων; conversely Opp. Hal. 5.64 εἰσορόωσιν ἀπόπροθεν.

478

ὑπὸ κραδίῃ : cf. viii.173. τεθνηπότες : not of course 'astonished' but 'stunned', 'shocked'; Petr.41 stupuere mentes.

479

The grim προφρονέως ('with gusto') and the curt meiosis of ἀπεχθεῖα have a Hellenistic ring. τελέωντες ... ἐφετμήν : an Apollonian expression (4.757 ἐτέλεως ἐφετμός / ~ O593 τέλειον ἐφετμός /) reproduced more closely by Nonn. (Met.9.152, 14.79 τελέειεν - ἄς /; ctr.id.15.52-3). Gr.Naz., like Q., has the sing., 591.163 ἐτέλεων - ἤν / . ἀπεχθεῖα : only occasionally in the Alexandrine hexameter (Call. Cer.116, Theoc.1.101, 141), but pervasive thereafter.

480

ἄμφω λίσσώμεν : cf. κ 259-60 οἱ δ' ἄμφω λίσσώμεν δολιχέες, οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν / ἐξεφάλη; ii.584 / πάντας λίσσώμεντας. ὑπὸ χθόνη : rare in epic: Hes. Th. 304, A.R.1.102, Nonn. D.2.142+2. Cf. Pl. F137.1, A. Eu.395, Supp.722, E. Alc.47.

480-1

τῶν ... / φαίνεθ' : φαίνεθ' is, pace Vian, present not imperfect. It is true that Q. uses the full ἔτι νῦν περ at x.131(-2); but cf. A.R.2.853 κείων ἔτι σήματα φαίνεται ἀνδρῶν / . [Vian* concurs].

481

φαίνεθ' ὅπου : cf. E 867 / φαίνεθ' ὁμοῦ . κατέδυεν ἐς = viii.368; hAp. 443 / ἐς δ' ἄδυτον κατέδυτε . φέρων Ἀπόλλωνος : again xiii.434; so A.R. 4.1218 Νομίῳ καθ' ἑρὸν Ἀπ. / ~ [Theoc.] 25.21-2 Ἀπ. Νομ. / ἑρῶν . For this temple see Vian, tome iii, p.230.8.

482

Περγᾶμω ἐν Σαδείῃ : E 445-6... Ἀπόλλων / Περγᾶμω εἰν ἑρῇ, ὅθι οἱ νηὶς γε τέτυκτο . προπαύροιθε ... : for the form cf. O355. Τρῳῆσι νῆες : 45n.

483

An ear-catching line with an inscriptional ring to it: it almost begs to be written in capitals. ἡμείλιχα : adverbial 5x in Q., and so [Opp.] Cyn.1.262. ἡμείλιχος is widespread in epitaphs. σηωθέντων : a claus. in Δ417 (... πένθος Ἀχαιῶν δ. /).

484

τέυξεν ... τάλφον : a common expression of course in verse epitaphs; cf. also

Rhesus 959; Lyc. 532; Or. Sib. 7.158-9. ἄμ' ἀγρόμενοι : ἄμ' is adverbial at i.211, iv.115, but prepositional at § 25, π 3; v.192; [Apolin.] 82.14.

κενέον τάλφον : κεν(ε) - τάλφος, τύμβος (in Tr. 486), ῥήμα (496) are all common in epigrams and metrical epitaphs. The third is elsewhere confined to those spheres, the second nearly so (Nonn. 2.628), the first is more wide-ranging, but mainly in iambs: E. Hel. 1057, Lyc. 366; Call. Iamb. F202.16; Nonn. Met. 20.16. In all three Q. has adj. first, and this corresponds to normal practice in literary verse (ctr. τάφος : Call., Nonn. Met. supr.; τύμβος : Phal. HE 2958; ῥήμα : Pancrat. id. 2857-8).

484-5

ῥ' ... / χένε : a like picture in x.386: παρ' (corr.) .. ῥ' ἔτο τάλφω ἐπὶ δάκρυα χένων /. For ῥ' ἐπὶ cf. θ 403, xiii.279 etc.

485

ἀλαοῖσιν ἐπ' ὀμμάσιν = i.76. There is no need whatsoever for ἐπ' (Pauw, Vian), cf. e.g. Leon. Tar. HE 2153 λίχνοισιν ἐπ' ὀμμάσιν ὑγρὰ δέσφοκως /, where ἐπ' expresses 'attendant circumstances' (Gow-Page ad loc.). For the repeat of the preposition (ἐπὶ 484) with a different meaning cf. e.g. [Mosch.] 4.96-7, and Gow on Theoc. 16.10f. [ἐπ' now Vian*]. — ἀλ. ὀμκ. elsewhere only in tragedy: S. OC 149, 244; E. Ph. 1531.

485-6

ἄμφι δὲ ... : these lines (and their sequel) invite comparison with GVI 1991.5-6 (Locris, ia?) ἄμφι τε μάτηρ / τύμβον ὁμοῦ θρήνοισ Ἄρχιον ἄμφι πολέϊ, id. 1502.5-6 (Phocis, iip) πολλὰκι δ' ἄμφι τεὸν μάτηρ τάλφον οἴκτρων ἄνδεν / ... ἄτενάσουα...

486

πολλὰ κινυρομένη : cf. [Mosch.] 3.43 περὶ δάμα κινύρατο. This verb was very often used of mothers (~ P 4-5 μήτηρ /.. κινυρή; note here vi.81-3 πολλὰ -ομένη .. / μήτηρ ... / ἐλπομένη; Call. Ap. 20; Triph. 430) and was no doubt the vox propria for the distressed animal mother (cf. xiv.282 ~ 286, esp.

Antip.Sid.HE 604, swallow whose offspring were devoured by a snake). /πολλὰ κ.
outside Q.(vi.81,xiv.384;so vii.335 /αἶνὰ κ.,xiii.262 /μακρὰ κ.;id.542
/ῆδ' κ.)only,I think,MAMA 1.319.3 πολλὰ κινυρ[ο]- /μενος... [no date
given];cf. /οἶκτρά κ. [Opp.] Cyn.3.217.GVI 694.6(Thebes,iip?),Nonn.12.
123,sim.epigr.ap.PEEK,SHAW 1974.3,p.8no.4,Agath.AP 5.289.8 [Viansino 89].

We do not know whether or not the word goes back to the archaic period
('Homerisch und alt ~~griechisch~~ sind nur κινυρῖσιν ...und κινυρός ' declares
Leumann,241):it is first attested in drama(A.Th.122dub.,κινυρόνται Dindorf,
but id.F474ii.6 Mette [Dict.] τί κινυρή; ~ paratr.Ar.Eq.11 τί κινυρόμεθ'
ἀλλῶς),was popular with the Alexandrines(A.R.5x,Bion 1.42, [Mosch.] 3.92,
more above)and very probably with their successors(Q. [including the certain
corrections at xiii.542,xiv.32] and Nonn.D. 10x apiece,occasionally else-
where:add to the above Colluth.215;Agath.AP 5.237.1 [Viansino 86]).

κενέω.. τύμβω:484n. ἐπαύτεε:6x in Q.;more in LSJ.

487

Similarly x.380(Heduba speaking) ἐλπομένη καὶ ἐτ' ἀλλὰ κακώτερον θηήεσθαι.
τι καὶ ἀλλο:an unusual sequence:it is plausibly conjectured by Martin in
Arat.443(τε καὶ cod.S,cf.the variants at Hes.Th.87,West ad loc.).

ἀλλο κακώτερον:in Homer in the order (τι) κακώτερον ἀλλο(Τ 321, Θ 138,
ο 343),and so A.R.3.79,910;v.574,cf.ix.94-5 [~Opp.Hal.2.4⁸0] οὐ γὰρ τι
κακώτερον ἐλπομαι ἀλλο/πῆμα. But /πῆμα φάη.. ἀλλο κακώτερον
Nonn.21.91(adduced by Vian,RPh 34,1960,302).

487-8

ἐβτενε...:cf. δ 261 ἀτὴν δὲ μετέβτενον;Lyc.194,676 βτένοντος(-ες) ἀτῆς.
ἀτὴν ἀφρ. =the ἀτὴ arising from,due to...,cf.Vian here. For the association
of these terms see hDem.258,A.R.1.1332-3,2.313. ἀνέρος ἀφραδῆ:after
E 649 /ἀνέρος ἀφραδῆσιν.

488

μακάρων...μηνιν:so β 66 θεῶν δ' ἐποδείξατε μῆνιν/. The phrase amplifies
ἐλπομένη...687:the higher powers have been offended,and there is no reason
to suppose that they have finished with Laocoon yet. For an excellent
treatment of μῆνις and cognates see Frisk,Eranos 44,1946,28f.,esp.31.

489f.

The simile bears a marked resemblance to that applied to the $\chi\epsilon\lambda\iota\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ whose young have been devoured by a snake, vii.330f. Both have points in common with the simile of the young of the $\epsilon\tau\rho\omicron\upsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$ in B 311f. (cf. Vian, RPh 28, 1954, 41); here there is only one specific linguistic echo (311 ~ xii.491), but note, outside the context of the simile, B 318v.1. 'the god made the snake $\acute{\alpha}\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$ ' ~ 480supr., B 321 $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\epsilon\lambda\omega\rho\alpha$ ~ 464supr. We shall never know precisely how derivative Q. was either in these similes or in others (Vian's speculations [op.cit. above] on 'exercices scolaires' seem to me too constrictive and unrealistic): what one can say is that a contemporary reader of xii.489f. would have found nothing particularly remarkable or original. The theme of the lamenting nightingale (regularly compared to the female mourner: Kannicht on E. Hel. 1107-12) is familiar from τ 518f. (cf. next note) and is widespread thereafter: Q. 490 $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\kappa\iota\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ reflects a constant detail, cf. e.g. τ 520 ~ [Mosch.] Ep. Bion. 9, S. OC 673, E. Hel. 1107; Catul. 65.13 sub densis ramorum... umbris ~ Virg. G. 4.511 populea maerens philomela sub umbra; [Sen.] Oct. 921 (in. nemore) — a detail present in the similes of the young of a 'bird' devoured by a snake in [Mosch.] Meg. 21f. (23 / $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\upsilon\kappa\iota\nu\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota$ after Hom.; cf. also 22 $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ $\nu\eta\pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ /; 24 $\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\omicron\nu\epsilon\alpha$ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $\lambda\iota\gamma\acute{\upsilon}$.. $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho$ /), Stat. Theb. 5.599f. (umbrosa... in ilice). For the $\chi\epsilon\lambda\iota\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ of vii cf. Babr. 118; Opp. Hal. 1.729f.; 5.579f., where note $\nu\eta\pi\iota\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\iota\gamma\upsilon\tau\alpha$, $\pi\alpha\tau\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma$.. $\phi\theta\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (~ xii.498-9), $\delta\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. It is possible that this last passage was in Q.'s mind, but given the relatively paltry quantity of imperial verse at our disposal we would do well to adopt an attitude of agnosticism, particularly as much of the language here has the flavour of the verse epitaph: see the following notes, and on 485-6 above, adding GVI 756.5 (Miletus, iia) mother $\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\upsilon\rho\omicron$ [$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha$] $\delta\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\eta\delta\acute{\omega}$ [ν]; id. 2088.5 (Thasos, iip?) $\theta\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$.

489-90

$\acute{\omega}\iota$ δ ' $\acute{\alpha}\tau$ ' $\acute{\alpha}\eta\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$: cf. τ 518. The theme of $\acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\alpha\delta\eta\eta$ there (523) may have suggested the bird-simile to Q. (cf. supr. 488), but the nightingale-motif may have been a traditional component in the blinding story, cf. on 389-417 § 2

(Call.), the more so as children also are involved, see previous note.

489

ὥς δ' ὅτε ἔρημαίην : so A.R.4.1298 / ὥς δ' ὅτε ἔρηματοι ... (of νεοῖοι).
ἔρημαίην ... καλὴν : of Nic. Ther. 451 (eagle) ἡρῆμωκε καλῶς / ἔρηματος
 also infr. 513(n.), vii.455 (νῆψω, cf. A.R.2.385, 672, 3.324, Antip. Thess. GPh 231),
 ix.402. This adjective (on which see Chantraine, Form. 48f.), extremely common
 in imperial verse, particularly in epigrams and metrical inscriptions, had
 already taken a firm hold in the Alexandrine era (Arat., Call., A.R. etc.). It
 is frequently found in contexts of lamentation (e.g. A.R.4.1298 et circa,
GVI 1540.5 [Smyrna, iia], 1746.3-4 [Erythrae, ip]). περιμύρεται : [Mosch.]
 3.89; conjectured by Spitzner at iii.506. ὑμῖν καλὴν : similarly vii.333
 (χρῆσθαι) χῆρῃ (leg. -ην : Keydell, loc. cit. on 65supr.) περιπέπτται
 ὑμῖν καλὴν /, cf. (Vian on) Nonn. 2.135. καλὴν, 'bird's-nest' : Gow on Theoc.
 29.12.

490

πολλὰ μάλ' ἄχνημένῃ : so i.814, iii.5, vi.650 / π.μ. ἄχνημένοι (~ Hes.
 Th. 623 / δηθὰ μάλ' -οι), a unit which closes a pentam. in IME 22ii.4(ii-iii).
κατὰ δάκκινον : cfr. hDem. 386. δάκκινον ὄγκος : here only. δάκκινον - again
 i.536 δ. ὄγκῃ / = O273, hHom. 27.7; v.498, viii.343 -ι(ος) ὄγκῃ / ~ Triph. 324.

491

xiv.284 (simile: bitch and whelps)... τῆς ὑπὸ νήπια τέκνα πάρος φάος εἰβόρ' ἀβδαί
 .. The phraseology is suggested no doubt by Homer's πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι /
 (π 218, of the stolen young of birds). ἔτι νήπια : cf. A.R.3.134, and X 484
 etc. νήπια τέκνα : in this sedes (see above) also Triph. 603, Nonn. 47.724;
 Homer v. τ. / (B 136al.), as at v.493, xiv.33. κελαδεῖνόν : I have not met
 this word elsewhere of the singing of birds, but κελαδεῖν κέλαδος εὐκέλαδος
 are commonly so used (some examples in W. Seelbach, Die Epigramme des Mnesalkes
von Sikyon und des Theodoridas von Syrakus, Wiesbaden 1964, 42; also (Vian*)
 M. Kaimio, Characterisation of Sound in Early Greek Literature, Helsinki 1977,
 169, 193. λείδειν : the terminal jingle with the previous line is no doubt
 intentional: cf. τ 518-9, Thgn. IEG 939 λείδμεν ὥπερ ληδών / (Fehling 154);
 Theoc. 12.6-7 with Gow's note.

492

δ' ἀμνασθ' ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσι : cf. ii. 575-6, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.286; for ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσι, vi. 410 ὑπὸ -οῖσι λέοντος/, ix. 244 ὑπὸ -οῖσιν ὀδόντας / = Nic. Alex. 421 ~ [Opp. Hal. 5.322 (ἐν γ.), Triph. 73 (ἐπὶ γ.). μένος .. δράκοντος : structurally (but not syntactically) comparable to [Orph.] A. 1005 μένος βριαροῦ δράκοντος /. βλοσυροῦ δράκοντος = xi. 74, cf. D. P. 123 δράκων βλοσυρωπός . A more familiar clausula is β. λέοντος : i. 5, and Antip. Sid. HE 594, Man. 5.196, [Apolin.] 21.42 (Golega 51; with βλοσυροῦ further back: Arch. ^h GPh 3704, Doroth. Cat. Cod. Astr. 6.109.242).

493

ἄλγεα θῆκε : cf. A 2 (Ἀχαιοῖς), X 422 (δ' ἐμοὶ ...) ἄλγε' ἔθηκε /. καὶ ἄπετον ἀχαλῶσα : xi. 210 ἄπετον ἀχαλῶσιν /; but v. 445 ἀδέχετον ἀχαλῶσα /, xiv. 424 καὶ ἀδέχετον ἀχαλῶσα /. ἀχαλ. is applied to a variety of creatures in similes: vii. 330, 465, xi. 210, xii. 580.

494

μύρεται .. δόμον : cf. Hes. Op. 206 /μύρετο sc. Ζηδών . Like language in [Opp.] Cyn. 3.102-3 (animals, seeing) κενεσὺς τε δόμους καὶ ἔρημα μέλαθρα / μύρονται ...

495

ὥς ἢ γε στενάχισε : so Colluth. 363 (corr.) /ὥς ἢ μὲν στενάχισεν ~ Nonn. 11.351 /ὥς δ' μὲν ἐστενάχισεν ; cf. vii. 393. See Kost on Musae. 115. στενάχισε : S. El. 1076-7 στενάχουε' ὅπως ... Ζηδών . στενάχισε ... ὀλέθρῳ : cf. i. 428 ἀκάνονται ἀδελφείων ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ /, and earlier [Mosch.] 3.31 (f.). Similarly Nonn. 24.199 ἐπέστενεν ἀνδρὸς ὀλέθρῳ /, E. HF 1065-6 στέναςέ νυν — στενάψω — τέκνων ὀλέθρον . λυγρόν : λυγρῶ Koechly, because of its location in the verse. Surely λυγρόν, which falls heavily on the ear, is immeasurably superior. For adverbial -όν with verbs denoting lamentation cf. v. 464, ix. 65; infr. 512n.

496

μυρομένη ... ῥήματι : see 484n., and cf. Pers. HE 2900 /μύρονται κενέον ῥήμα ...; ii. 644 ὀλοφυρομένους .. περὶ ῥήματι παιδός /, Nonn. 15.348.

496-7

ἔνν ... ἄλῳ : full of emotive sounds (ἄλῳ, -ἄλῳ, ἄλῳ ; -μα μί- ; π- ... π- π-) but clumsily expressed: one would expect the unit ἔνν ... ἄλῳ (for which see Koechly on iii.670) to cohere, and πέλειν with dat. is overworked in imperial verse. ἄλῳ / πῆμα = ix.94-5, cf. A.R.2.137-8; ctr. κ 300. πῆμα ... πέλειν : but hAp.304 πέλει πῆμα.

497

μάλ' ἄργαλέον : cf. M63 \pm υ μάλ' -έη , and Emp.F114.2; in reverse [Theoc.] 25.274.

498

φίλα ... ἄνῆρα : 261n.

499

ἄμμορον ἡελίοιο : elsewhere differently applied, to: (a) the sunless Cimmerians: [Orph.] A.1122 / αἴγλης ἄμμοροι ... ἡελίοιο / sim. APlen.303.3-4, cf. Nonn.45.269 (and 38.52); (b) Tectaphos shut up in βέρειθρον : Nonn.26.109 / ἄμμορον ἡελίοιο ; (c) still-born children: AP 14.125.5 ἡελίοιο πανάμμοροι.

500-524

A host of dire omens passes the bemused Trojans by.

In both Il.Parv.(235) and Il.Pers.(246) the admission of the Horse is followed by 'feasting' which will have entailed sacrificing: [Apollod.] 5.17 is more explicit, and cf. e.g. E.Hec.917, Tz.Posth.716. It is possible, though hardly verifiable⁸⁵, that the gods rejected the sacrifices in the cyclic accounts: this at any rate is what happens in Triph.(446-7). In Q. the gods vent their displeasure more actively, though it is only Cassandra who is allowed to benefit from the manifestations of their wrath(529f.). That the motif is not new is proved by Dictys 5.7-8: shortly before the city's fall a Trojan sacrifice fails to burn(cf.Q.503), and exta disturbata ad terram decidunt(~ Q.505f.); and by Cedrenus(in the romance-tradition): Hist.Comp.131 πύρ ... ἐβέννυτο, μὴ καιομένου, πίπτει τὰ ἐν τῷ βωμῷ πάντα εἰς τὸν ὄδαφος κτλ.

In Dictys the rejected sacrifice is followed immediately by a mention

of Cassandra. But her involvement in the omen-scene in Q. is, to say the least, awkward. Her claim that the Trojans will not believe her, however much she says (546) is said by her to be the result of the intervention of the *Kḗρες* who deprived the Trojans of all powers of reasoning (548 ~ 523); but Cassandra is not believed by the Trojans in normal circumstances (526f.). Her speech is in fact an uncomfortable amalgam of warnings against the Horse (and she would know that they would go unheeded) and observation on the effect of external agencies manufactured by the poet.

The long omen-list⁸⁶ reflects something of the simplicity of the brief list in μ 394f.:

τοῖσιν δ' αὖτις ἔπειτα θεοὶ τέρατα προῦφαινον·
 ἔρπον μὲν ῥ' ἴνοι, κρέα δ' ἄμφ' ὀβελότῃ μεμύκει,
 ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὠμό· βούων δ' ὥς γίνετο φωνή.

But it owes more, I suspect, to the dry style of the romance and/or popularizing prose handbook, cf. Cedrenus above. Extended lists⁸⁷ are of course characteristic of Roman poetry; it is open to us to claim Roman influence at work here. I do not believe that there is. It is true that the majority of items in Q.'s list can be paralleled in Roman omen-lists, but it is also true that it does not resemble a single one of them either in general style (they are never straightforward 'and...and...and...' sequences: they are in prose, e.g. Tac. Hist. 5.13, but Q. could get prosaic lists in Greek; they abound in extravagant particularization of places or personalities, in personal exclamations of woe, in moralising etc.) or in choice of themes (none of the favourites is in evidence: comets, ghosts roaming abroad, earthquakes, vocal cattle, clashing of arms or noise of trumpets in sky, thunderbolts, showers of stones etc. etc.). Possible points of linguistic contact include: 505-6 *μῆρα* *τρομέοντα* ~ Ov. Met. 15.576 *trepidantia*. . . *exta* sim. Sen. Oed. 354; 508 *ἐφέροντο* ~ Ov. Met. 15.792 *cantusque feruntur*; 519 *μᾶλα μυρία* ~ Stat. Theb. 7.402 *plurima*; 520 *φέροντα* = 'signify' ~ Claud. IV Cons. Hon. 192 *adparet quid signa ferant*. But none is particularly astounding, and we would do better to note that some key elements in our passage possess a distinctly,

as opposed to a vaguely, Greek literary flavour: see the ensuing notes, esp. on 511; 513 (Aratus!) 518-9 (ctr. e.g. Virg. G. 1.486).

500

ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπεντύνοντο θυηλάς : cf. A.R. 2.156-7 (sim. [Orph.] L. 743-4) ἀθανάτοισι θυηλάς / ῥέξαντες, Man. 5.198; for the term θυηλαί see Kost on Musae. 39.

501

λείβοντες .. λαρόν : so xiv.379 / εἰς ἄλκ' .. λείβον μέθυ after A.R. 1.534 μέθυ λείβον ὑπερθ' ἄλκ' ; xiv.103 λείβετον μέθυ λαρόν ἐπ' αἰδομένησι θυηλῆς (ironically echoing this line: the victorious Greeks). For λαρόν cf. also (a)(i) iii.691(ii) claus. iv.279, and (b) xiv.334 / πῖνον ἀφύγεσθαι μέθυ . For (a)(i) cf. A.R. 1.456 / εἴδατε καὶ μ. λ. (ἀφύγεσθαι), 659 / ἤλα καὶ ... (= Γένος Πινδάρου 18, see 164n.) ~ [Orph.] A. 1237 / ὄϊτον καὶ ... ; [Opp.] Cyn. 4.279; Gr. Naz. 623.572; Nonn. 14.125 (... ἀφύγεσθαι /). For (b) cf. A.R. 1.473 / πῖνε χαλίκρητον λ. μ. , id. 968; [Opp.] Cyn. 4.332. ἐπεὶ ... ἐώλεται = vi.69. There are variations on this run (exclusive to Q.; Homer has θυμὸς ... ἐώλεται / T 328al.) in iii.78, 477; vi.298, cf. ii.107. viii.37. ἐπεὶ σφίβιν = Π 549, A.R. 4.341, Opp. Hal. 3.63 etc.

502

Λευγαλέου πολέμοιο : substantive first in N 97, iv.327-8, ix.126-7. πολέμοιο ... ἐξυπαλύξαι - recalls iii.344 (εἰς ἐξυπαλύξας /), vi.14 θανάτοιο βαρὺ σθένος . For βαρὺ σθένος I can furnish no solid parallel in Greek: cf. Ov. Pont. 1.3.63 grave..robur? This verb also i.327 (εἰς ἐξυπαλύξας /), viii.416, orac. ap. Porph. Plot. 22 (Parke-Wormell 473.19), [Orph.] L. 584 (the last three in nautical contexts). ἐξυπαλύξαι Pauw, rightly. The Trojans were badly shaken by Laocoon's blinding, were afraid that they had offended Athene (415f.), and were witnesses to the horrible fate that overtook Laocoon's children (463f.). However, their reception of the Horse was cordial enough (even if their glee is more muted than in Virg. or Triph.) and they must surely have believed by now that the Greeks were gone for good. Such an attitude is strongly implied in their subsequent treatment of Cassandra, and the completion of the war is taken for granted by the typical (Τις 5) Trojan at xiii.17. So we expect here

not a preventive sacrifice, but one of thanksgiving, cf. Il. Parv. 233, Il. Pers.

246f. (εὐωχούνται ὡς ἀπληλλαγμένοι τοῦ πολέμου), E. Tr. 524, Virg. A. 2.26 (sim.

id. 248f. cf. Ov. Met. 8.264f.) ~ Petr. 12, Triph. 243f. al.; similarly in Dictys 5.12

the Trojans celebrate because of securitas pacis.

503

ἔρα ... καίοντο : A. R. 2.1175 ἔρα καίειν /. πυρὸς ... ἀντημή : cf. π 290 al.

πυρὸς — ἀντημή / (see Graz, 308f.), ii.224 πυρὸς (corr.: πάρος) δ' ἐξέβλυτ' ἀντημή /, viii.90 πυρὸς καταδάμνατ' ἀντημή / after hHerm. 137 πυρὸς καταδάμνατ' ἀντημή /.

504

Similarly ii.351 /ὄμβρου ἐπεβρυμένοιο δυβηχέος, cf. 225n., and for καθύπερθε M 286.

505

καπνὸς ... ἀνεκῆκίε : cf. Pl. F185 κακίει καπνός, κηκ — in A. R. 1.389, 4.1188; 4.929, ἀνακηκ — in A. R. 4.600, Triph. 322. αἵματοεις ἀνεκῆκίε : an association found in Nonn. 4.454, 30.143 αἱμαλέης ἀνεκῆκίεν ... (cf. id. 39.248-9), and prefigured in H 262, with which may be compared S. Ph. 696, 784; vi.582.

506

πῖπτε χαμαί : cf. Δ 482 etc. χαμαὶ πέβεν (—ον), and for the form Δ 525-6 = Φ 180-1 ἐκ δ' ἄρα πᾶσαι / χύντο χαμαὶ χοιλάδες. κατηρείποντο δὲ βωμοί : xi.155 κατ. δὲ λαοί / ~ Nonn. 20.178 —α, περιρραίνοντο δὲ βωμοί / (cf. ἑτερόχοντες 177 ~ infr. 508; λύθρω 179 ~ ibid.).

507

γένοντο = turned into: Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 79, p.125. θεῶν : i.e. their images, cf. Tib. 2.5.77 etc.

508-9

are reminiscent of the battle-scene of vii.146-7 δύνοντο δὲ τεῖχεα λύθρω / λευγαλέω· στοναχῇ δὲ δαίκταμένων πέλε φωτῶν. For δύνοντο λύθρω cf. also iii.317, vi.279; Nonn. 7.174, 25.68.

509

ἐκποθεν ἀπροφάτοιο = iii.437, cf. A. R. 2.224, 824, 3.1289 (/) ἐκποθεν ἀφράτοιο (/).

ἐκ ποθε(v) 15x in Q., with gen. (7x, cf. supr. and A.R. 3.262; Paul. Sil. Euphr. Soph. 815corr.) or absolutely (cf. Or. Sib. 14.298; [Orph.] A. 821; Gr. Naz. 523.21(?); Christod. 129). Cf. ex occulto in Cic. Div. 1.99. περιβέλλοντο δέ : cf. T 382.

509-10

μακρά / τείχεα : the same pattern in vii.580-1 ἐπετενάρχοντο δὲ μακρά / τείχεα. The Homeric clausula τείχεα μ. is employed at vii.426, but in Q. this component is more mobile (vi.34, xi.498; vii.481+2). τείχεα καὶ πύργοι : of Troy ii.30 ἐκ πύργων καὶ τείχεος, viii.420-1 τείχη / πύργοι θ' ὑψηλοί, of the Greeks xiv.633 / τείχεσι καὶ πύργοισιν ~ H 436-7 τείχος .. / πύργους θ' (v.l. δ'; om. vulg.) ὑψηλούς. Cf. Vian on vii.480.

510

μεγάλ' ἔκτυπον : cf. Ψ 119-20 (trees) μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι / πίπτον; μεγάλα κτυπεῖν elsewhere in Homer of Zeus' thunder: Θ 75, P 595, φ 413, cf. 56n.

ὥς ἔτεόν περ : 142n. Unless this can bear the sense 'as if they were really giving forth a resounding din' (i.e. they appeared to be making a din, it was in fact illusory), a lacuna after 510 (Pauw) seems necessary: as if they were really [cf. M 460] <being battered by weaponry> 'or the like. ὥς ἔτεόν anyway should be left alone: cf. ὥς in Nonn. 45.328. (The sense of ἐῖ ἔτεόν [Erbse 567], if indeed it has any sense, would be out of tune with Q.'s style). — Vian* agrees that a lacuna is preferable.

511

For this phenomenon see Vian, Rech. 70. The language bears a strong resemblance to A.R. 4.41 τῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτόματα θυρέων ὑποείξαν ὀχῆες (cf. E 749, Θ 393); cf. Nonn. 6.250; 7.317; 44.21-2 (→ portents); 45.282-3; 46.140. ὀχῆες .. πυλάων; as Call. Ap. 6 κατοχῆες ἀνακλινάσθε πυλάων /.

512

αἰνὸν κεκλήγοντες : see 58n., and P 756, 759 / οὔλον κ. ἐπετενάρχοντο δέ — x = vii.580, x.368, xi.245; hapax Hom., Δ 154 ἐπετενάρχοντο δ' ἑταῖροι /. For λυγρόν cf. iii.591 περιβτενάρχοντο δέ λ. /, and 495n.

513

ἐρημαῖον βοῶντες : so Arat. 1003 κόρακες... ἐρημαῖον (Martin: ἐρημαῖοι)

βοῶντες / ~ κεκλήγοντες / 1004. Cf. 489n. For the creatures in question see Pease on Virg. A. 4.462.

514-6

Similar sequences in Nonn.⁴¹ 256-7 ἄτρα καλύπτει / ἄννεφέλους ἀκτῖνας οἰκετεύουσα Σελήνη ..., and ii. 626-7 πάντα κατέκρυφεν Οὐρανὸς ἄτρα / ἀχλύϊ καὶ νεφέεσσι, xiii. 552-3. For ἄτρα, ἀχλύς, οὐρανοῦ cf. A. R. 2. 1103f.; for the last two, v 356-7; for ἄννεφ, in a portent-episode, Nonn. 42.6.

514

θεοδμήτοιο πόλῃος : so Koechly: θεοκμήτ- codd.; likely, given Φ 516, [Hes.] F235.4 εὐδμήτοιο πόλῃος /, E. Andr. 1263 θεοδμήτον πόλιν, and Θ 519, i. 801, x. 13corr.; besides, -δμητος suits 'une construction', -κμητος (iii. 203al.) implies a notion 'de travail, de fatigue ou se dit d'un objet forgé' (Vian*).

515

ἀχλύς : Ἀχλύς is present (along with the Keres) at the life and death struggle of a city under attack in Scut. 264f. (cf. C. F. Russo, Hesiodi Scutum, Florence 1950, 13f.). For the quantity of the final syllable of this word (ἀχλύς ἄρ' Rhodomann) see Wernicke 288f.; Rzach, SBWW 100, 1882, 348. ἀχλύς ἀμφεκάλυψε : so in the doom-laden Or. Sib., 5.481, / ἀχλύς ... κόμῃ πύχας ἀμφικαλύψει / ... ἄννεφέλων : cf. D. P. 531 - οἷο δι' ἡέρος εἶδεταί ἄτρα /.

516

οὐρανοῦ αἰγλήεντος : 104n. ... δαφναί : cf. Stat. Theb. 8.203. The δαφναί may well be a detail derived ultimately from tragedy (E. Alexandr. ?) : cf. E. Andr. 296, Tr. 329.

517

πὰρ νηῶν Dausque: νηῶν Y: νηὶ δὲ H. I feel a slight preference for the accus. The trees do not stand by the temple but in rows running the length of the temple. Cf. Bacch. 16.11f., E. Ion 219. Tz. perhaps read the accus. here (Posth. 406).

518

These beasts are coupled in the celebrated τῆνον μὲν θῶες, τῆνον λύκοι ὠρύσαντο (Theoc. 1.71), and so id. 1.115, N 103, Or. Sib. 2.8, vii. 504 (ἀναιδέειν 505), xiii. 133. ἀναιδέες : so v. 17-18 λέοντες / .. καὶ θῶες ἀναιδέες ~

Opp.Hal.2.625 $\theta\omega\epsilon\varsigma \dots \lambda\nu\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, [Opp.] Cyn.4.213 $\kappa\alpha\iota \theta\omega\alpha\varsigma \lambda\nu\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$.

$\omega\rho\upsilon\beta\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$: for this verb applied to wolves see Livrea on Colluth.116, adding Arat.1124.

519

$\epsilon^{\prime}\nu\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu \pi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon$ -ix.287,ctr. [Hes.] Th.741(c.v.1.) $\pi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\upsilon \epsilon^{\prime}\nu\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon$. Corruption to $\epsilon^{\prime}\kappa\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu$ is common, e.g. i.235, § 13. $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \dots \epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\nu}\theta\eta$: the Vian-Tychsen correction may be regarded as certain, cf. [Theoc.] 25.88-9 $\beta\omicron\epsilon\varsigma \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota \alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota \dots \phi\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\nu\theta^{\prime}$, and p 422= τ 78 $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota \alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda\alpha \tau\epsilon \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} / \dots \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ - is found only occasionally outside Od. and Q., cf. above and: π 121 $\mu. - \acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ (=Rhian.? POxy.2522.B.6), o 556 $\mu. - \acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ ($\frac{1}{2}$ = Opp.Hal.2.439); Q.5x. For $\alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda^{\prime}$ cf. Hes.Op.100=v.97 $/ \alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda\alpha \delta\epsilon \mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$; A.R. 1.681-2. $\alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda^{\prime}$: $\omega\varsigma$ Scarcella 518, who objects to $\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha \alpha^{\prime}\lambda\lambda\alpha$, but that of course is not to be taken too seriously, any more than are (e.g.) Ov.Met.7.275 his et mille aliis...sine nomine rebus, Stat.Theb.2.223, 6.294.

519-20

$\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\nu}\theta\eta / \epsilon\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$: B 308 $\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta} \dots \epsilon\eta\mu\alpha$.

520

$\pi\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$: 'spelling', cf. the use of $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ at x.489, with Vian's note. Ctr. $\pi\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ in μ 231; i.370, xiii.459, xiv.532.

521-2

$\alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu \dots \alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$: cf. vii.55-6. Repetition of even relatively unusual words within the space of two lines (not always the result of formulaic pressure) is widespread in Homer (cf. Lehrs 450f.): Ptolemaic papyri show a tendency to eliminate them, West, PP 49, on B 828. Q., who, being a latecomer, has earned a poor name for his offerings (see e.g. ii.293-4, iv.37-8, vii.294-5, viii.220-1; Castiglioni 39f.) may simply be following in his master's footsteps. More self-conscious stylists than he indulged themselves: cf. e.g. Vian, REA 75, 1973, 87f. (A.R. and others); Keydell, BZ 46, 1953, 1f. (Nonnos).

521

$\delta\epsilon\alpha\mu^{\prime} \alpha\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu$: claus. at iv.483, vii.544. $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} \dots \phi\acute{\rho}\epsilon\nu\alpha\varsigma \acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon$: Koechly's $\delta\pi\omicron$ is attractive (cf. 200n., ix.80, x.99; A. Eu.155f. [see Lloyd-Jones, CR n.s.

13,1963,157], A.R.3.675,1404,Nonn.Met.15.39),but falls somewhat short of certainty:Thgn.IEG 787 οὐτίς .. τέρψις ἐπὶ φρένας ἦλθεν (negative,as here), Musae.95,cf.Ibyc.SLG 171.2(lacunose).

522

ἀλεγεινὰ τεράτα :Opp.Hal.5.113 ἀλεγεινὸν .. τέρας ('monster'). For τέρας =Schreckenszeichen see K.F.Nägelsbach,Die nachhomerische Theologie...,Nürnberg 1857,169f. τεράτα :for the form see Buttmann 1.216,Schwyzler 1.515. Other examples:(i)Ezek.F128.226Snell τερ(α)τα suppl.Mras. (ii)D.P.604 / κείνα .. τεράτα ~ vi.275 τεράτα κείνα ;v.43 τ. πάντα ;infr.542. [(iii)Tz. Anteh.293 τεράτα .. πάντα/]. κατ'ἄβυ :[Theoc.] 20.44;Homer κατ'ἄβυ, but cf. A.Pers.1071;S.OC 67,78;E.Alc.430,al.;Ar.Av.1014.

523

νόον ἐκβαλον :a stronger version of i.590-1 μακάρες φρένας ἐξείλοντο / καὶ νόον (~ Scut.149);for the expression I can quote nothing closer than S.Ant.648-9. That the Trojans in general were made oblivious to all these goings-on is a reasonable enough idea;indeed,it is expected. Cf.schol. Θ494: once the Horse was inside the city,the Trojans fell to wondering if it contained anything: ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ βλάβεα αὐτῶν τὰς φρένας καὶ ἡ εἰμαρμένη ... ὅφρ' ἐπὶ δαίτι :it is a pity that the reading of PSorb.Inv.2245A at 248 is not intact: ὅφ[ρ'] ἐπὶ δ. [(δὲρπν Bérard, δειπν Lloyd-Jones, see West PP 235).

524

πότμον ἀπαληύωμι :ii.655(-ωμι),cf. Λ 263(-αντες). ἔπ' Ἀργείοισι δαμέντες =iii.191;i.805 δαμάμεν.

525-585

Cassandra appears on the scene with some harsh words for the Trojans, but is promptly chased away.

[Apolloclod.] 5.17 makes Cassandra a central figure in the debate in Troy over what to do with the Horse(Καββάινδρας ... λεγούσης ἐνὸπλιον ἐν αὐτῷ δύναιμι εἶναι, sim.Hyg.108). His paraphrase of events at this stage is so close to that of Il.Pers.(241f.)that it is reasonable to suppose that Cassandra

appeared in Arctinus too—a supposition which is strengthened by Dio Chrys. Or. 11.128 (cf. with Proclus *ἐποπτεύοντες, βουλευόμενοι*), where (page Davreux 72) Cassandra appears to utter her warnings after the Horse ^h has been admitted ('they ate and went to sleep, and did so in spite of...', cf. Q. 549f.). Aeneas in Virg. A. 2.246-7 dismisses Cassandra's pronouncements with the air of one who expects his audience to be familiar with the details: tunc (i.e. when the Horse had been taken to the citadel) etiam fatis aperit Cassandra futuris/ora dei iussu non umquam credita Teucris. Triph.'s version (358-443) is similar to ours in structure and in content⁸⁸; but there are also sharp differences both in tone (Triph., if nothing else, does manage to whip Cassandra into a respectable state of frenzy⁸⁹) and in detail: for example, in Triph. the Horse is on its way to the citadel and not housed in it, and it is Priam, not the Trojans, who replies to her (Q. excludes Priam from the Sinon-debate also: pathos means nothing to him). It may be significant that Q.'s portrayal of Cassandra the hatchet-bearer, which can be paralleled in art long before his time⁹⁰, is not present in Triph.: Cassandra urges the Trojans to smash the Horse with hatchets or set fire to it (412f.)—a detail reminiscent rather of her function in the debate over the Horse in $\langle \text{Arctinus} \rightarrow \rangle$ [Apollod.] ~ Dio Chrys. (in whom the two methods proposed are *κατακρύβει... ἢ φιάτεμεν* cf. Tz. Posth. 709 after Triph. [the hatchets disappear]: *καταξεί ἢ καταπρήξει*).

So there may not be after all a direct connexion between the two poets, or even (Vian, Rech. 71) 'a common source'—a notion which seems to me to be unrealistic in both quantitative and qualitative terms: we suffer at times from a near desperate shortage of information on crucial saga details, but there is no justification for pushing the same shortage back into the world of the Roman empire; the range of 'classics' in general circulation was certainly restricted from c. 300 A.D.⁹¹, but we need only reflect that a poem as late as Nonnos' Dionysiaca, for all its flashy showmanship, still has much to tell us about the Dionysus cycle of myth. The stylistic gulf speaks for itself.

Traditional features in Q.'s depiction of Cassandra (and some of the

differences in Triph.) are discussed in the ensuing commentary. But Cassandra lurks under other stones. The episode of the burning of the ships by the Trojan women in Virg. A. 5.605f. presents some interesting correspondences with Q.:-

623 o miserae ~ 540 ὦ Σειλῶ!

(635 exurite puppis:cf. suggested firing of Trojan Horse).

636-7...Cassandrae...ardentis...faces ~ 568-9 πένκης / αἰθόμενης.

641 infensum...ignem ~ 574 πῦρ δ' ἰοόν ...?

648 ardentis...oculos ~ 537.

660 rapiuntque focis penetralibus ignem ~ 569 δαλὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐχρησῶνος ἐλόντα.

670 quis furor...? ~ 556.

677 diffugiunt ~ 584 ἀπεβύτο.

Q. is not of course using A. 5: Virg. is thinking of Cassandra's conduct at a gripping moment in the saga and applying it to an episode of his own.

Excursus

Laocoon=Cassandra.

Virgil's Laocoon also has much in common with Cassandra—to an extent that has not been fully appreciated.

In <Arctinus →> [Apollod.] 5.17 Laocoon is evidently a pure doublet of Cassandra (like her, he is a μῦθις, and utters warnings). It could be that his original colours are in evidence in Petr.: he is crinem solutus not because he is unhappy (Stubbe) but because he is Cassandra's male counterpart (535-6n.), who shouts noisily (530n.). Is this rather unimposing figure in fact the Laocoon of the cycle, who either in conjunction with Cassandra or alone attempted to assault the Horse—with an axe if not with a lance?

Virg. portrays Laocoon as a splendid priest-chieftain. For all his splendour, the 'doublet-aspect' shines clearly through. I include in what follows some passages which resemble V.'s Laocoon-episode, passages which are dealing with members of the female sex:-

40f.: the contextual difficulties in these lines have been mentioned above on 389-417, § 1. There is an identical pattern in A. 5.668f. (see above), where

no difficulties arise:668 primus..Ascanius ~670 quis furor...? ~671 heu miserae cives. Ovid applies the sequence to Niobe,Met.6.165f.:she arrives comitum..celeberrima turba,tossing head and hair inmissos umerum per utrumque (cf.Q.535-6 with the note),quis furor etc.170(cf.id.3.529f.).

41:ardens:cf.the traditional ardentes oculos of Cassandra,537n. The word alludes briefly to Laocoon's agitation,cf.Serv.auct. quoted by Austin ad loc.

41:ardens...ab arce:Cassandra's usual place of outlook(cf.in general E.Tr. 522):700;Colluth.392. So Virg.A.4.407f.,Dido watching the flurry of activity surrounding Aeneas' departure [model:Cassandra watching Paris' departure from Troy?]:300f. she rages through the city like a Bacchant (~Cassandra Triph.367f.,with which compare 703),410 she watches arce ex summa ~A.7.377f.,Amata:rages through city like Bacchant,shouts;women ventis dant colla comasque(cf.Q.537-8);she wields torch,has rolling eyes,cries aloud ~A.6.517f.,Helen with torch,like Bacchant,summoned Greeks summa..ex arce(519).——Sil.4.774f.,Imilce fills city with cries like Bacchant,shouts; sim.Lucan 1.674f.,matron like Bacchant rushes through city,has a vision,(681)quis furor...etc.

42:o miseri,quae tanta insania ~Triph.376-7 Cassandra: ὦ μέλῳιμαίνεσθε, cf.Q.540.

42 cives:Enn.Alexandr42 cives ferte opem,likely to be from Greek tragedy,cf. Jocelyn p.207.8;Dracont.Hel.159,176.⁹²

525

οὐχ :that Cassandra was the 'only' one to see the impending destruction must have been a commonplace:cf.Virg.A.3.183;Prop.3.13.63-4 sola Parim Phrygiae fatum componere,sola / fallacem patriae serpere dixit equum,where the warning is uttered once the Horse has entered the city(serpere ~Virg.A.2.240 inlabitur;other such versions in Vian on 573-4,p.223). Cf.μόνος of the male counterpart Laocoon in Tz.Posth.713. ἐμπεδον ἡτορ reverses K 93-4(of terror) ὄρε' μοι ἡτορ / ἐμπεδον . ἡτορ ἔχεν :the pattern epithet: ἡτορ : ἐχ- is frequent in Homer,see 582n.;cf.here Π209 ἑὺ δ' ἄλκιμον ἡτορ ἔχων.

πινυτών τε νόημα : here only, but πινυτός qualifies νόος at Man.6.560
(-οῦ τε νόου), Luc. AP 11.410.6, SEG 15.528.5 (Samos, ivp? Robert, Hellen. iv,
p.59), Nonn. 5.350; and cf. GVI 1256.4 (Rhodes, c.200a) πινυτάτι νόου /. For the
shape cf. Gr. Naz. AP 8.152.1 πόλιόν τε νόημα /, and (υ-⁴υ) -όν τε ν. / in
Antip. Sid. HE 598; Opp. Hal. 2.643; i.42⁴, ii.326.

526-8

Trag. Adesp. 414 Nauck ἄκραντα γάρ μ' ἔθηκε θεοπίσειν θεός κτλ. has often been
assigned, with some plausibility, to E. Alexandr. (=Snell F11). Both Q. and the
author of the Orphic Lithica (765f. Apollo κακάνδρην ἐκέλευεν ἄκουόντεσσι
ἅπαντα [ἄκραντα Toup] / θεοπίσειν τρώεσσι ἐχέτωμά περ φρονέουσιν
cf. verum in Hyg.93 etc.) are using traditional terminology; so too does Triph.,
but it is of a different kind: with 417-8 cf. A. Ag. 1212-3, [Apollo.] 3.12.5
etc. ⁹³ — The Cassandra speech in Triph. (376f.) has the air of a tragic
rhetoric, and it is conceivable that Cassandra's observations on the Horse in
E.'s Alexandr. (for the context see Coles 27) were a direct influence on
Triph., who, recall, is no longer a descendant of Nonnos. They may have left
their mark on Q., but if so, I am sure they came to him via an epic filter:
ctr. Jouan, REG 83, 1970, 252.

526

ἔπος γένετ' : A.R. 1.1103=3.145. ἔπος .. ἄκράντων : cf. τ 565 ἔπε'
ἄκράντα (opp. ἔτυμα 567), Pi. Q. 1.86 ἄκράντοις .. ἔπεσι, and the repeated
ὡς ἔφατ' ἄκράντων ἔπος at iii.250, vii.522.

527

ἄρ' ἐχέτωμον ἔδκεν : so ii.20 ὄκ ἄρ' -ον ἦεν / (A.R. 4.74 -ον ἦεν /),
v.272 ὄκ ἄρ' -α βάλεις /, ix.482 τὸ δ' ἄρ' ἦεν -ον ; ψ 62 μῦθος -ος.
ἄκουετο : passive e.g. D.P. 191, Colluth. 227. ἔκ τινος αἰέτης = vii.10, cf.
GVI 1949.9-10 (Hermupolis, iip) ἔκ τινος ἐβλήης / μισήης, and for the form
hAp. 433 ἔκ Διὸς αἰέτης /. Q. is evidently for brevity's sake vaguely
attributing Cassandra's plight to τύχη (from which αἰέτα and μισήτα in Q.
are normally not essentially different: Rohde, Gr. Roman ³ 302.3), which, though
absent in Homeric epic (see recently Braswell, CQ n.s. 21, 1971, 25) plays a part
in A.R. (Vian on 3.328 τις αἰέτα ~ v.582, x.377). The details of her contre-

temps with Apollo (Fraenkel on A.Ag.1202) are suppressed. $\dot{\iota}\nu' \alpha' \lambda\gamma\epsilon\alpha \dots$ (cf. malis in Prop.3.13.62) is presumably intended as a 'comment' more in keeping with the result (on $\dot{\iota}\nu\alpha$ cf. Schneider, Call.2.411), particularly at this moment, than with Apollo's express purpose: but cf. Dracont. Hel.183f.

528

Δνεμώλιον: popular with late poets; again infr.554; iii.82; iv.89 (~ Δ 355).

$\dot{\iota}\nu' \dots \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$: cf. 53 (αἶδα ... 52) $\dot{\iota}\nu' \alpha' \lambda\gamma\epsilon\alpha$ πολλὰ πᾶσιν, X 287

Τρῶες γένοιτο /. Lasc.² has γένοιτο here.

529

ἡρ': cf. e.g. 326. εἴματα λυγρὰ: Z 168 (claus.) in a different sense.

κατὰ πόλιν: ii.5 etc., cf. B 130al.; often elsewhere.

529-30

κατὰ πόλιν εἰβενόησεν / ... ἴαχεν: cf. Cassandra in Ω : 700 εἰβενόησεν /, 703 γέγωνέ τε .. κατὰ δότυ [~ Triph.367] /.

530

εὖς ἐν : 209-10n. μέγ' ἴαχεν εὖτε : 175n.

530-8

Triph. also likens the frenzied Cassandra to a wounded animal and describes her in terms appropriate to the behaviour of a Maenad (358-75), but the correspondences are not so sharp that borrowing either way is certain. A description of ecstatic behaviour prompts an elaborate animal-simile in E.Ba.866f.; Triph.'s comparison of the Bacchic woman, lacking in Q., moves along wholly traditional lines: cf. μαῖνας/maenas in E.Tr.308 etc., Prop. 3.13.62, Ov.Am.1.9.38 (see below on 535-9), and the passages involving Cassandra-types referred to on 525-585supr. Further, whereas Triph.'s Cassandra is allowed the epic licence of ranging 'throughout the city' (367), Q. seems to be grappling with the picture of a possessed stage Cassandra (cf. A.Ag.1072f., E.Tr.308f., Alexandr. Coles p.26 etc.) who emerges from her chamber (535) to perform the appropriate contortions (535f.) and deliver a set-speech (539) at the palace-front in sight of the Horse (545n.) — a picture at variance with the activities of the lioness (cf. 533) who runs madly about (cf. Cassandra in Ov.Ep.5.121) πᾶν τε : cf. πᾶν τε in Triph.

367.

530-3

Cf. the description of Ajax in v. 371f. — The theme of the roaring lion wounded by a hunter and running amok is a hackneyed one: cf. Vian here and on iii. 142f. Short comparisons involving the lioness are not uncommon in Greek (e.g. E. El. 1162f., Call. Cer. 50f., Theoc. 26.21, Nonn. 48.788, 918); the only example of an extended epic simile outside Q. (also i. 315f., lioness jumps cattle, compared to Penthesileia; iii. 202f., lionesses angry with hunter over <slaughter of> cubs) appears to be Nonn. 3.388f. (In Homeric epic the 'lion' sometimes behaves oddly, cf. P 134f. with schol. [Wyss on Antim. F147], Σ 318f.; H. Frankel, Die homerischen Gleichnisse, Göttingen 1921, 92f.). Roman epic yields a weightier crop: Ov. Met. 13.547f. (lioness rages at loss of cub); V. Fl. 3.737f. (cubs); Stat. Theb. 5.203f. (attack cattle), 10.414f. (defends young), 12.356f. (roars, roams at large). For a wounded lioness cf. Claud. Ruf. 1.226.

531

ἐνὶ ζυλόχοισιν ἄνῃρ = Opp. Hal. 1.237. ἐνὶ ζ. (not Homeric) 5x in Q., and Opp. Hal. supr., 2.360, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.474, Nonn. 41.195; also ἐν -οίῳ (v) (Σ ...) i. 525al. = Arch. GPh 3618, Opp. Hal. 2.614+2, ἐνὶ -οίῳ v-x ii. 575, xiv. 259 = [Opp.] Cyn. 2.296, 331, Colluth. 42, ἐν .. -οίῳ v-x. 68 conj. ἄνῃρ λελιημένος ἄνῃρ: repeated from vii. 569, cf. viii. 364.

532

οὐτάῳ ἢ ἐβάλῃ: after Φ 576 μιν (sc. παρδαλιν) χ οὐτάῳ ἢ ἐβάλῃ μιν / (cf. 571 η τορ, 573 η ύτε ..., ibid. ζυλόχοιο, 574 ἀνδρός). For the distinction cf. also = 424, Opp. Hal. 5.260, viii. 117-8, and Lehrs 51f., Trumphy 92. τῇς ... η τορ: cf. P 111 (lion-simile) - η , τῷ δ' ἐν φρεσὶν [~ vi. 129] ἀλκιμον η τορ / ... μαίνεται ἡτορ: see 65n., and for μάρνεται (codd.) Wernicke 371.

533

ἀν' ὄρεα μακρά: ix. 162, cf. [Mosch.] 3.39 ἀν' ὄρεα μακρὰ v-x. μαίνεσθαι ἀνὰ is acceptable in itself (cf. Theoc. 2.49 πῶλσι μαίνονται ἀν' ὄρεα, and, e.g., [Mosch.] Meg. 16, Υ 490; Sen. Oed. 919 per arva..insanit leo), but (see Vian here) the subject η τορ is awkward, and one expects some reference to the roar of the lioness (~ ἔλχεν 530). A lacuna after 532 (Koechly) is

necessary. πέλει ... ἄλκη :ctr.i.705 πέλει δέ οἱ ἄπετος ἄλκη / (cf.

Π 157 τῶν τε ... ἄπετος ἄλκη /, and [Apolin.] 88.97), ii.523 ἄπετον ἄλκην / (~ [Apolin.] 70.43); for ἄπ- ~ ἄχ- also ii.250 πέλει δέ οἱ ἄχετος (ἄπ- ~ ἄχ-) ὄρμη /, x.444 ἄχετος ὄρμη / (~ Gr.Naz.1566.201, Max.303 ἄχετον ὄρμην /); ix.242 ἄπετος ὄρμη /.

534

μαιώωσα ... ἦτορ :cf. E 670 μαίμηδε δέ οἱ .. ἦτορ / . θεοπρόπον ..

ἦτορ : similarly AP 1.10. ἦτορ .. θεοπρόπον . This may go back ultimately to a tragic model, cf. E. Andr. 1072 πρόμαντις θυμός etc. (see Sideras, op.cit. on 87 above, 168); at any rate it will be traditional language: cf. Cassandra's δαιμόνιον κέαρ in Pi. Paean 8.2. ἐνδοθεν ἦτορ = vii.537 [f.l.xiv.435], cf. v.171. This Homeric clausula (δ 467) appears also in Or. Sib. 3.3 (corr.) +2, Gr.Naz.999.395+2. κέαρ ἐνδοθεν (iii.504=v.568) goes back to A.R.1.274 (~ Bacch.17.86).

535

ἦλυθεν ἐκ μεγάρου :cf. π 165,343 ἐκ δ' ἦλυθεν (-ον) μεγάρου (adapted by A.R.2.202); γ 441 ἦλυθεν ἐκ θαλάμου ; L 647 etc., ii.160 ἐκ μεγάρου.

535-9

Triph.'s Cassandra (530-8n.) is compared to a Maenad who παρήορον ὄμμα τιταίνει / γυμνὸν ἐπιβείουσα κάρη (371-2), but set descriptions of her prophetic fits must have been ten a penny (cf. Sen. Ag. 710f.: she shakes, her hair stands on end, her eyes roll, she is a maenas), and neither component strictly matches our version: (i) 537, her eyes flash (cf. the lioness, and the oculi ardentes of Enn. Alexandr. 17.32 ~ Virg. A. 2.405; cf. Dares 12); but Triph. is clearly thinking of ὄμματα γαστροφύ (see e.g. Lucan 5.211f., and Dodds on E. Ba. 1122-3). (ii) Triph.'s 'head-shaking' is represented in Q. as 'neck-shaking', 537: see Dodds on Ba. 862-5; Stat. Ach. 1.523, in giving Calchas a Cassandra-style fit, says nec colla loco nec in ordine gressus. Q. refers also to streaming locks of hair (cf. e.g. Virg. A. 2.403f.; Ov. Am. 1.9.38, Ep. 5.114, 16.121) with the implication that they are tossed, a detail familiar from the vivid description in E. IA 758f. (cf. Dodds, Gks. & Irrat., 273f.): but χαίτην κοπτομένη Triph. 374f.

535-6

Similarly xiv.277-8 κόμαι δέ σ' ἄχρισ .../ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐκέρχυντο, ix.364
 ἀνὰ λεία δέ σ' ἀμφὶ κόμαι περὶ κρατὶ κέρχυντο. One cannot help but be
 reminded of Archil.IEG 31 ἢ δέ σ' κόμη /ῶμους κατεκίασε καὶ μετὰ φρενα.

536

ῶμοις ἀργυφέοισι :cf.i.142 κνήμησιν .. ἀργυφέῃσιν (-υρ- codd.). For
 ἀργυφ- of bodily parts see Livrea on A.R.4.1406, adding Gr.Naz.1494.204
 (corr.Wernicke 123); Nonn.38.129; Peek s. ἀργυφός. μετὰ φρενον :see Vian
 here ~ Ebeling s.v. μετὰ φρενον ἄχρισ ἰούδα :sc. εἰς, see 178,406nn. Cf.
 vi.409 /ἀίχμη ... μετὰ φρενον ἄχρισ ἴκανεν /, and for the form ix.69 — α
 μέχρισ ἰούδα /.

537

ὄββε δέ σ' οἱ :elsewhere εἰ ...: A 104, δ 662; Scut. 390; A.R.4.1437. ὄββε
... ἀναιδέα :a similar run in vii.464 ὄββε δέ σ' μάρμαiren ἀναιδέος εἴτε
 λέοντος, where, as here, Q. recalls A.R.2.407 (dragon) ἀναιδέα .. ὄββε /. For
 'shameless eyes' see Bulloch, CQ n.s.20, 1970, 271. μάρμαiren :once in Homer
 of the eyes, Γ 397 καὶ ὀμματα—οντα /= [Opp.] Cyn. 4.157, cf. vii.362, and
 orac. ap. Phleg. cited on 105; so [Opp.] Cyn. 3.70 (κόραϊ); i.59 (ὀφθαλμοί);
 xiv.183 (καὶ φάεα—οντα /). τῆς δ' ὑπὸ σειρή :again xiv.316. Cf. Γ 371
 ὑπὸ σειρήν /, Alex. Aet. CA 3.33 ἢ δ' ὑπὸ σειρήν /. 'Her neck below <her
 head>' is no stranger than Homer's 'feet below', 'head above'.

538

εἰς ἀνέμων =xiii.490 and Sol. IEG 12.1; cf. xiv.500 ~ D.P.670, Opp. Hal. 3.450.
ᾧ τε :cf. 580; 12x in Q. ᾧ δην :here probably 'constantly': see Pfeiffer on
 Call. F269. ἐλελίσσεντο πάντη :xi.418-9 ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντη / γυῖ' ἐλελίσσεν
 Ἄτλαντος (~ X 448).

539

καί ... ἑτονάχηγε :cf. xiv.28 /καὶ ῥ' ἀμέγα ἑτονάχισεν (?corr.: ἑτοναχίσεν?),
 i.573 /ἢ δὲ μέγα ἑτονάχηγεν ~ Agath. AP 5.287.5 [Viansino 74] ... — ἡγε καὶ
 ἡλαιο, v.486. ἑτον— is often written ἑτεν— in manuscripts (Buttmann
 1, 202f., 2.241); cf. Vian on i.573, v.321. For the language cf. Pi. Paeon 8.1f.
 (Cassandra) ἐκλαγζε ... ἑτοναχαις. καὶ ἰάχε : γ 62; A.R.1.1314 (—εν);

Rhian.(?) Poxy. 2883.i.15; Nonn. D. 12x. Triph. prefaces his Cassandra-speech with $\lambda\rho\iota\lambda\chi\epsilon$ (375), but shrieking is regular in prophetic delivery (Fraenkel on A. Ag. 156; Lloyd-Jones, JHS 83, 1963, 89) and Cassandra is no exception to the general rule: cf. Pi. loc. cit. above; E. Andr. 297 $\beta\acute{o}\alpha\epsilon$; Ov. Ep. 16.123 exclamat; Hyg. 108 vociferaretur; Tz. Posth. 709 $\beta\acute{o}\alpha\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon$. $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$: cf. E. Tr. 41, 252 etc. 540-51

Cassandra's general message is, naturally, the same in Triph. 376-416. The sole linguistic correspondence is Triph. 376 $\omega\acute{\iota}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\omicron\iota \sim$ Q. 540 $\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\iota$. There are very different approaches to the traditional vision-routine ('I see blood and fire' Triph. 391f. cf. 442f. \sim Q. 540f.: cf. Cassandra in Enn. Alexandr. 17.41 adest adest fax obvoluta sanguine atque incendio): Triph.'s highly-charged extravagances resemble those of Lyc. 251f.; Q.'s picture, which possesses the dubious advantage of making Cassandra see the future through a cloudless crystal ball, is flat and jejune (like Sil. 1.125f., 8.656f., both pathetically inadequate representations of paranormal behaviour) and barely rises above the level of the prosaic (cf. the description of a prophetess in Plut. Pyrrh. 31: $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\eta\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \lambda\alpha\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\acute{\nu}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\omicron\phi\eta\tau\iota\varsigma\ \lambda\alpha\pi\acute{o}\lambda\lambda\omega\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\ \beta\omicron\omega\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \delta\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\ \tau\eta\ \nu\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\upsilon$), failing to retain anything of the uncanny atmosphere of Theoclymenos' prophecy of doom for the suitors in ν 345f., which form the basis for verses 540-51 et circa: verbal echoes: Q. 540 $\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\iota \sim$ 351; 540 $\delta\pi\acute{o}\ \delta\acute{o}\phi\omicron\upsilon\sim 356$; 551 $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu \sim$ 355 $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\lambda\omega\upsilon$; other close correspondences: 550 [cf. 508] $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon\epsilon\theta'$.. $\delta\acute{o}\rho\pi\alpha$.. $\pi\epsilon\phi\omicron\rho\upsilon\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\rho\omega$ / \sim 348 $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\phi\acute{o}\rho\upsilon\kappa\tau\alpha$... $\kappa\tau\epsilon\lambda\ \acute{\alpha}\theta\iota\omicron\upsilon$; loss of senses through supernatural agency 523 \sim 346; ensuing banquet $\delta\acute{o}\rho\pi\alpha$ 550 \sim $\delta\acute{o}\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon$ 392; cf. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi'$ corr. [574-] 575 \sim $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi'$ 393. One may note also the strong insistence on laughter and mockery (552, 563, 566 \sim 346, 347, 358, 374, 390); tears (507 \sim 349); $\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu \sim$ $\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\gamma\eta$ (468 cf. 508 \sim 353); blood (505, 507, 541 \sim 354); $\lambda\chi\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ (515 cf. xiii. 11-12 \sim 357; cf. A. Eu. 379); 561 $\lambda\phi\alpha\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha \sim$ 360 $\lambda\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$; 565 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \nu\acute{o}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta'\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\theta\omicron\rho\omicron\nu$ / \sim 367-8 $\nu\acute{o}\acute{\epsilon}\omega\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu$.. $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu$; also $\pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\theta\upsilon\rho(\omicron\nu)$ xiii. 20 \sim 355.

540

$\tilde{\omega}\ \delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\iota$ at the beginning of a speech Λ 816 etc., iii. 167, xi. 217. $\beta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$

ὑπὸ (ὁφόν) : an identical sequence in [Hes.] F280.23 (but βῆμεν infin.).

541

ἐμπλεῖον ... αἵματος : cf. xiii.81f., and 119, v 26 / ἐμπλεῖον ... καὶ αἵματος. For 'fire and blood' see above on 540-51; orac. ap. Hdt. 7.140.3: 1 ὦ μέλεσι ~ 6 πῦρ ~ 11 αἷμα ; Dodds 87.38.

542-3

τεράτα φαίνουσι : cf. μ394 θεὸν τέρτα προῦφαινον /, v 114 τέρας ... φαίνεις / etc. For τέρτα see on 522. The beginning of 543 resembles α 201 ο173 / λθάνουσι βάλλουσι καὶ ...

543

ἐν ποδὶ ... : so, with a different metaphorical association, vi.432-3 παρὰ ποδῶν Ὀλεθρος / ... πέλει, sim. vii.549-50. ii.486 provides a sure case of personified Ὀλεθρος, but I feel inclined to print here ὀλέθρου, as 'lie at the feet of' hardly conjures up a vivid pictorial image of the kind found in, say, Hor. Carm. 1.4.13, Tib. 1.10.34, Lucan 2.100 — unless Ὀλέθρου = Destroyer = Horse, cf. E. Tr. 12. [Gow argues for Ὀλέθρου at Opp. Hal. 1.560 (CQ n.s. 18, 1968, 62), wrongly in my opinion; Ὀλεθρος already in A. Eu. 935f., surely].

544-5

Triph. employs similar language when he muses in propria persona on men's heedlessness and ignorance of the future (310f., note ἐχέτλιον, ἀφραδέων, χάρματι); but we are dealing here with a topos cast in a style basically alien to Q. (for the technique involved see the passages collected by Pfeiffer on Call. F318; Richardson, hDem. pp. 243-4).

544

ἐχέτλιοι, οὐδέ : ἐχέτλι — is followed by οὐδέ(ε') at vi.388 ~ Hes. Th. 488, xiii.16; 1630, δ 729, φ 28, ψ 150 (ἐτλη) ~ GVI 119.3 [Icaria, ii-iii] (ἐφθη). Cf. iii.114. κακὸν μόνον : i.586, iv.101, xiv.580 (ἐξήλυζε κ.μ. ~ Germ. AP 9.17.3 ἤλυζε κ.μ., cf. hHom. 7.51 κ.μ. ἐξάλυντες /; S. Ant. 488-9 ἀλύζετον / μόνον κακίτου; A. R. 2.339 κ.μ. ἐξάλεάιδε /; Gr. Naz. 772.89 κ.μ. .. ἐπάλυξαν /). Homeric, Φ 133 (κ.μ., εἶδ' ἔκε πάντες /), al., also Nic. Ther. 15, Diod. GPh. 2134 (= GVI 1472), Gr. Naz. 612.433.

545

χαίρετ' ... γάρ : cf. Ω 706. ἀφραδέοντες : a charge tossed back at Cassandra
infr. 561. ὁ : the Horse, of course : cf. my note ap. Vian, REA 75, 1973, 100.3.

μέγα πῆμα υ - x : cf. P 99 ~ viii. 454; 49n. κέκευθεν : see 443.

546

ἀλλὰ ... πείθεσθ' : ω 456 / οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ πείθεσθ' , χ 316 / ἀλλὰ μοι οὐ
πείθοντο , vi. 44 / ἀλλὰ μοι οὐ πείθονται (cf. Θ 154). Ω 's πείθεσθ' and
 γ γορεύω could be preserved if we could really believe that Cassandra is in
a highly emotional state ('you are not in the habit of doing as I say <nor
will you on this occasion>...'); but this speech is as dry as dust. οὐδ'
... γγορεύω : cf. ω 174 $\mu\eta\delta'$ εἰ μέλα πολλὰ γγορεύοι / $\sim \Theta$ 22 (~ x. 18, see
1n.) οὐδ' εἰ μέλα πολλὰ κέμοιτε /.

547

Ἐρινυδες : cf. xiii. 382 et circa. For the association of Erinyes and Keres¹
(548) see West on Hes. Th. 217, Kakridis 172; 'although manuscripts often give
Ἐριννύς, Q. is not likely to have written the word so', West, art. Q., p. 258.
γάμου .. αἵνου : elsewhere only A. R. CA^F 12. 19 αἰνότατον γάμον , [Opp.] Cyn.
1. 257 γάμος αἵνός ; but cf. αἶνογάμου ... Ἐλένης in Anon. Trag. ap. Page, Lit.
Pap. 30. 17, and Kannicht on E. Hel. 1120 for αἶνο — applied to the Paris-Helen
relationship. κεχολωμέναι αἵνου : cfr. τ 324 κεχολωμένος αἵνω / . For
κεχ. cf. i. 29-30.

548

ἀμφ' Ἐλένης : xiii. 356, 379, 519, cf. id. 470; ἀμφ' - η Hom., Γ 70 etc.

Κῆρες ἀμείλιχοι : 5x in Q.; cf. also ii. 172, v. 34; viii. 139.

549

πάντη ἀνὰ πολίεθρον = xiii. 563. For / πάντη ἀνὰ cf. A 384, Zen. at Π 156;
for ἀνὰ πτ., A. R. 1. 825; i. 8al. ἐπ' εἰλαπ/ῃ : ii. 113, cf. ii. 134, ix. 488;
E. Med. 193; [Orph.] F 297(a) 8.

550

ῥετατα : cf. (suitors) δ 685 / ῥετατα ... δ επνήσειαν / , ν 119. κακῶ
.. λυθῶ : similar in form is ν 435 - α, κακῶ μεμορυμένα καπνῶ / . κακῶ

π. λ. / (Opp. Hal. 5.269 λύθροιο φορύβεται ἐκχυμένοιο / cf. ii.485-6) also xi.319, cf. xi.473 — α λυγρῷ πεπαλαγμένα λ. / (conj. πεφορυγμένα: see 472), x.60 πεπαλαγμένα λ. /, a reversal of the normal λ. πεπαλαγμέν — (viii.287, xi.14, sim. iv.26, cf. Z 268al., Call. Lav. Pall. 7, [Orph.] A.1235; Nonn. 20.63-4).

551

ἐπιψάοντες here, pace Vian, governs ὄσον, cf. Opp. Hal. 1.436 (hawks fly close to the water) / ἀκροῦ ἐπιψάοντες ἄλως πόρον. [So now Vian*]. For ὁμῆν ὄσον cf. GVI 1547.9 (Rome, iip) ἄλλ' ἤδη μακάρεσσιν ὁμῆν ὄσον εὐανιόντας; κ 41 ὁμῆν ὄσον ἐκτελέσαντες / (~ vii.69 ἐκτελέσαντες ὁμῆν .. κέλευθον /).

551a?

Hermann suggested a lacuna after the speech: one might expect in view of Q.'s practice elsewhere a concluding formula of the type 'so she spoke'. There are exceptions in epic and other genres, some of which are dealt with by R. Führer, Formproblem — Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik, Munich 1967, 45f. Many cases fall into sharply definable categories, as (i) Δ 250 / ὡς ὅγε ~ A.R. 3.740 / ὡς ἦγ', 4.421 / ὡς τώγε ἱύμβαντε [Pi. P. 4.168 εὐνθεῖν ταύταν ἐπαινέσαντες σὺ μὲν ...; Musae. 221 / ὡς σὺ μὲν ... συνέθεντο]; χ 200 / ὡς ὁ μὲν ... ~ Isyll. CA 77, [Orph.] A.1155; hDem. 434 / ὡς τότε μὲν ... ~ A.R. 2.811. (ii) α 360 = φ 354 / ἦ μὲν ... cf. Call. Lav. Pall. 5.93, A.R. 2.262; id. 3.471 / ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὡς; Nonn. 20.142 / καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς. But there is a fairly sizeable residue that (pace Führer at times) cannot be so readily classified: e.g. τ 413 ~ A.R. 4.1746; μ 374; Call. Dian. 105, Del. 215, Cer. 42al., F24.13 [Aet.] al.; Batrych. 82; [Orph.] A.110, 266; Nonn. 15.392 and passim. Formally our sequence has something in common with (P 414 / ὦδέ σε τις εἰπέκεν Ἀχαιῶν ...) P 420 / ὡς σε τις .. Τρώων .. ἀνδράκεν /; and many a speech in Nonnos is capped simply with καί + change of subject.

552

καί τις : see A. Ag. 590. For this unit heralding a speech cf. xiii.468... ἐκφατο μῦθον / ~ Musae. 73 ... φάτο μῦθον /; i.211, iv.19, x.470; supr. 254n. ... κερτομένων ... : cf. i.574. There is an imposing (if not always lucid) description of the mockery to which Cassandra was subjected in Troy in A. Ag. 1269f. In Triph. (~ Tz. Posth. 711f.) it is Priam who scornfully replies,

and he does more than chase Cassandra away(419f.). ὀλοφώιον ἐκφάτο
μῦθον: see on 24; A.R.4.410 ἣ δ' οὐλοῦν ἐκ. μ. /, 'which spelled ruin', as
 ὀλοφώιον here: West's ἀποφώλιον is bad.

553

ὦ κούρη Πριάμοιο: cf. E 464 / ὦ υἱεὺς Πριάμοιο, and N 173 / κούρην δὲ
 Πριάμοιο. Cassandra is 'Priam's (young) daughter' at Triph. 358 / κούρη δὲ
 Π., cf. Ibyc. PMG 303(a), Pi. P. 11.19. τί' ἢ νύ 6ε: vi. 41, cf. i. 723; v. 509
 ('What is wrong with τί' ἢ νύ τοι?') Lloyd-Jones 274).

553-7

μάργος ~ γλῶσσα ~ λύβη ~ μῦθον: μάργος γλῶσσα I can parallel only
 with Gr. Naz. 1548.81, but we are dealing here with a reflection of tragic
 language (note the sequence in A. Pr. 883f. [Io] λυβῆς (πνεύματι) μάργω,
 γλῶσσης λόγῳ ...) and, no doubt, with specific 'Cassandra-terminology'
 (cf. Triph. 434 μαργαίνουσα; and id. 422 etc. λυβῶσθε' νοῦν [see 556n.],
 436 ἔρρ' ~ Q. 558).

554

γλῶσσα: cf. lingua in Prop. 3.13.66 (from tragedy?). κακοφραδὴ: again
 xiii. 259 - ἴησι υ - x ~ hDem. 227, v. 1. β 236. The singular occurs in Nic. Ther.
 348 (emended to a plural by Beazley in CR n.s. 4, 1954, 98). ἔνεμώλια πάντα
ἀγορεύειν: see on 420, 528.

555

παρθενικὴ ... αἰδώς: so in Triph. 368 ἀίπερ .. ἐ παρθένοσ αἰδώς /, a
 traditional feature: Enn. Alexandr. 17.33 virginalis modestia. For the expression
 cf. A.R. 3.681-2 μιν αἰδώς / παρθενίη κατέρυκεν, Gr. Naz. 571.642 / αἰδῶ παρθενίης
 (in a passage full of Apollonian echoes: read - ἴην), id. 1548.77 παρθένοσ
 αἰδώς /; IG 4(2) 228.8 (date disputed) παρθενίην .. αἰδῶ. παρθενικὴ: this
 koine adjective is inaccurately labelled 'late and rare' by Page-Gow on
 GPh 2310-11. At λ 245 παρθενίην ὥννην there existed an ancient variant
 παρθενικήν, and - ἰκός appears in A.R. 1.791 (cf. Campbell, CQ n.s. 21, 1971,
 408), Mosch. Eur. 73 (μῖτρην). To the examples quoted by Bühler on Eur. loc. cit.
 may be added: - epigrammatists: Leon. HE 2244; Euen. GPh 2310; Agath. AP 1.37.2;

GVI(i-iii:)235.2, 282.2, 437.5, 536.3; others: [Bion] 2.17; Or. Sib. 2.280, 8.472;

[Orph.] L. 737; Gr. Naz. 554.423, 904.272, 1394.2; Jo. Gaz. 1.325. ἀκηράτος ..

ἀιδώς : so xiv.55 καὶ ἀκηράτον ἀιδῶ /, where see Vian. This could well be a remote echo of a tragic expression: cf. A. F355.23 Mette ἀιδῶς .. καθαρά, and

E. Hipp. 73f. ἀμπεύει ἀιδῶς : here only, but cf. xiii.425-6 οἱ ἀιδῶς /...

ἀμπεύουσι; xiv.19 ἔχεν δ' ἔ .. ἀιδῶς /, Musae. 97 (see Kost) αἰδῶς δέ μιν ἔχεν , and the tragic ἀιδῶς μ' ἔχει (A. F73 Mette, E. Hec. 9⁷ Oal.).

556

ἀλλά ... ὀλοή resembles Π849 / ἀλλά με μοῖρ' ὀλοή ... λύβ' ὀλοή : cf.

I 305 / λύβαν .. ὀλοήν , Opp. Hal. 1.362; but the λύβ' α of Cassandra (Triph. 422 λύβ' α δ' εἰ νόβ' α / ~ S. Aj. 452 λύβ' α δ' εἰ νόβ' α of the hero; Christod. 190)

will of course have figured in tragedy, which offers a galaxy of similar

sufferers. Cf. v.405 (Ajax) ὀλοόφρον' α / λύβ' α / ~ S. supr., and Alc. SLG 262.16

Αἴας δ' ἔ λ λύβ' α ἡ λ ὀλοήν ἔχων ... περιέδρομε : λύβ' α courses (cf.

Schneider 82f.) round the body like a disease: A. R. 3.676 ἡ λύβ' α θευμορίῃ

περιέδρομεν ἡ λύβ' α νοῦ β' α : τῷ λύβ' α = x.375; cf. iv.318, xiv.440 ~ A. R. 3.74; xiii.281.

557

Strongly Odyssean in flavour: θ 308-9 ἐμὲ χολὸν ἔόντα ... / αἰὲν ἀτιμάσει ,

ν 141 εἰ ἀτιμάσουσι θεοί , ξ 506 μ' ἀτιμάσουσι ... ἔχοντα / ; β 200 πολύμυθον ἔόντα / .

558-9

Comparable rough words in Virg. A. 11.399f. (Turnus to Drances) capiti cane talia demens , / Dardanio rebusque tuis ; Stat. Theb. 3.648f. (Capaneus to Amphiaraus) tuus o furor auguret uni / ista tibi .

558

ἔρρε ... : i.765 / ἔρρε καὶ ἐν φθιμένοιισιν .. ἀγόρευε . —οἶσι ...

φήμην : cf. A. R. 2.889 —οἶσι κακὴν προτιόβομαι ἀτην / . κακὴν .. φήμην : so

vii.288 κακὴν δ' ἀποπέμπεο φήμην / , [Hes.] F176.2 κακὴν δ' ἔφ' ἐμβαλε φήμην / (—ἡν ... —ην odd.), cf. Babr. 49.5. The substantive precedes in Hes. Op. 761, E.

Hel. 614-5, Man. 2.298, 3.87, 338.

559

τάχα γὰρ εἶ :cf. Z409 τάχα γὰρ εἶ κατακτανέουσιν..., [Theoc.] 27.8, Opp. Hal. 4.345. καὶ .. ἄλγος :cf. δ6⁹₈ τε καὶ ἀργαλειώτερον ἂν ἴδοι
X54-5 μινυνθασιώτερον ἄλγος /έβεται.

560

The shamelessness of Cassandra prompts a comparison with the 'shameless Laocoon', an appraisal which does not quite tally with that of 415f. and which is close to the Trojan reaction in Virg. A. 2.229f. But the dramatic circumstances have changed, and the speaker venomously recalls Laocoon as an opponent of the Horse which for him spells the end of the war.

οὐ γὰρ εἴοικεν :206n.

560-1

Similar in form: Nonn. 27.26-7 οὐ θέμις ἐβὰ δαί' ξαί / Πανὸς .. δέμας ..
61δ⁹₇ / . Cassandra has said nothing about destroying the Horse (ctr. Triph. 412f.), and we have not been told that she is brandishing an implement for that purpose. It would appear (cf. Vian, Notice 77) that we are to imagine her as armed all along (note φέρεσκεν 570); έβουτο μαιμώωσα (570) simply picks up μαιμώωσα ... ῥ' ἴσθιν (534-5), έβουτο being pluperf. in sense (Chantraine 2.200; it is better to print a stop after μαιμώωσα , and a comma after βουπλήγῃ 571). It may be that at the back of all this implied gesture lies a stage treatment. At the same time I find it hard to resist a suspicion that behind the sequence '...the shameless Laocoon, because...' lies an original applicable to Laocoon himself qua δαί' κτήρ , particularly as the masc. sing. participle ἀφραδέοντα appears to be correct, whereas in a general statement addressed to a female one might have expected the masc. plur. (so H^c ; cf. Fraenkel on A. Ag. 562, Barrett on E. Hipp. 287 and pp. 366f.).

561

ἀθανάτων .. δῶρα :Thgn. IEG 446 ~ 1162f. δῶρ' ἀθανάτων ; much more often θεῶν δῶρα ; combined in Sol. IEG 13.64 / δῶρα ... θεῶν .. ἀθανάτων / .
φίλῃ δῶρα = θ545, v 41. — The genitive is of course objective, like domum.. Minervae in Virg. A. 2.31; cf. supr. 237. For the plur. cf. θεῶν in θ 509?
δαί' εἶμεν :sc. βουπλήγῃ (cf. x. 217-8, xi. 189-90; Nonn. 44.158). Maybe Virg.'s

foedare(A.2.55) is translating this very verb. See on 560-1.

562

ὧς ... τις : i.373=iv.32;xiii.19;cf.i.755,xiv.605(Δαναῶν),xiii.478(μερόπων);
x.477 /ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη Νύμφη τις ἔνδ' φρένας ;supr.259. ἔνδ' πτόλιν :464n. The
phrase is presumably inspired by the kind of sequence one finds in A.R.1.240
ἑκάστος ~ 247... κατὰ πτόλιν :there the preposition denotes various points
in the city,here only 'in',as τις proves to be not πᾶς τις but a single
individual(cf. ἄλλοι ,and iv.32f.etc.)—as if our Trojan could be anywhere
else. ὧς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι :173n.

563

μωμήσαντο = ἐκώφαν,cf.Gow on Theoc.10.19. ἄρτια βάλειν : = 92, θ 240.
For ἄρτια cf.E.Tr.417,Talhythius scornfully to Cassandra: ὦ γὰρ ἄρτιάς ἔχεις
φρένας.

564-5

Π 852-3 Λ 131-2 ἄλλα' τοι ἤδη / ἄγχι παρέτεκεν θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταῖη,
vi.427 ἄλλα σοὶ ἄγχι παρίσταται σὺλομένη Κηρ,cf.i.103-4(αἶψα ~ ι 52-3).
See Headlam-Knox on Herod.1.16.

564

σύνε' ἄρ' ἔφ' ἱ61 :vii.130,cf.iii.13,xiv.522. ἔφ' ἱ61 πῆμα :433n. καὶ
ἀργαλέον σοὶ —x:cf. Σ 119, T 214, χ 137. Αἶψης :see schol. θ 494 cited
on 523 above.

566

εἰς ῥέος ἵππου :44n.

567-71

Tradition offered various methods for destroying the Horse:fire commonly
(cf.393supr.);weapons:—χαλκός θ 507(Trojans);Laocoon's spear,Virg.etc.;
his axe,Petr.23f.;Trojan axes,Triph.254. In Triph.412f. Cassandra suggests
that the Trojans use either axes or fire(cf.Dio Chrys.Or.11.128). [Vian,
Rech.71,argues that Triph. must be using Q. for the axes in the debate at
254,as he does not follow the literary original of the frescoes in Davreux
132f. But,new chronological data apart,it is possible to use a variety of

sources without draining an individual item of every detail] .

567-8

Q. is thinking of A.R.4.391-3 (Medea) ἴετο δ' ἡγε / νῆα καταφλέξει δάτ' /
 ἔμπεδα πάντα κεά' ἔβωι, / ἐν δὲ πειθεῖν αὐτὴν μαλερῶ πυρί. κεά' ἔβωι (a
 reverse correction is obligatory in iii.154) was conjectured here by Rhodo-
 mann; Browning, CR n.s.17, 1967, 254f.; van Krevelen, Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 446.

Browning terms the conjecture 'virtually certain'; I should prefer 'possible'.

Q. certainly imitates A.R., but rarely slavishly, and in favour of the trans-
 mitted reading one may invoke i.490 (κεά' ἔβωι con. C.L. Struve), esp. v.207-8

6ε .. / ἀμφιτόμας ἱφ' ἔβωι δὲ μελεί' ἔτι κεά' ἔβωι ; note further A.R.2.1126,
 1189; vi.380 (~ Ep. adesp. CA 4.19); xiv.596 (~ η 275); xiv.656. If κεά' ἔβωι
 is right Q. will be varying ο 322 δάτ' τε ἵν' αὖτε κεά' ἔβωι / (~ Call. F243,
 where see Pfeiffer).

567

ἡ γὰρ οἷ : ξ 96. Still, one might have expected rather δὴ γὰρ οἷ , cf. viii.
 354, ix.25, xi.471, xiv.568; xi.94, N 517; v 30 δὴ γὰρ μενέαινε ; A.R.3.95 / καὶ
 δὴ οἷ μενέηναι.

568

καταπρήβαι : ctr. O 507 ἐνιπρήβαι μενέαινει /. This compound also Lucill.
AP 11.131.2, ix.539; ii.8 (tmes.), cf. καταπρή' θοντ' in xiii.436; it is common
 in late prose. One might perhaps have expected it to appear in X 512; but see
 Hainsworth, JHS 78, 1958, 53f.; Graz 250f. μαλερῶ πυρί : 445n. Ctr. ! 242
 (threat) / αὐτὰς τ' ἐμπήσειν μαλεροῦ πυρός (sc. νῆας) → i.368.

568-9

πλώκης / ... δαλόν : cf. xiv.621-2 πλώκην / αἰθομένην ἀνέλειρε ; xiv.393-4
 πλῆτρην / αἰθομένην ἔτι (corr.: ἐπὶ, ἐπεὶ) ; N 319-20 ἐνιπρήβαι ... /
 ἐμβάλοι αἰθομένον δαλόν, A.R.4.1720-1 δαλοῖς / .. αἰθομένοιβιν , xiii.147-8
 ἔτι κιομένοιβιν ὅπ' ἐχρεώετο .. / δαλοῖς . Further: Gow on Theoc.24.88.

569

δαλόν ... ἐλούεα : for the form cf. A 501 ὅπ' ἐνθρεώενος ἐλούεα /. Q. may
 be recalling Theoc.24.48 πῦρ ... ὅπ' ἐχρεώενος ἐλόντες / and even (if he could

make better sense of it than do modern editors) Leon. Tar. HE 2009 ἐχάρευν ~ 2011 δαλὸν ἐπεχάριον. ἀπ' ἐχάρευνος : also xiv.26; ἐχάρευν : add to the above v.504 (παρ' — ὦνι), xiii.147; Nonn. Met. 18.116 and D. 10x(38.204 παρ' — ὦνι); Christod. 316(id.). On the word see Chantraine, Form. 164; LSJ ἐχάρευν.

570

ἐββυτο μαιμώω : after E 661, O 542 διέββυτο μαιμώω / . ἐτέρη ... φέρειεκεν : cf. iv.559 ἐτέρη δ' ἐνὶ (corr.: ἐν) χειρὶ τινάδεων / , χ 183 / τῇ ἐτέρη .. χειρὶ φέρων ; Arat. 97 ἐν χειρὶ φέρει.

571

ἀμφίτυπον βουπλήγα = i.159 : normally ἀμφίτομος (Opp. Hal. 5.257-8; xi.190 = Nonn. D. 5.14+2). There is clearly a point of contact here with Triph. 254, 'some Trojans wanted to smash the Horse ἀμφιτόμοισι .. πελέκεσσιν' [cf. Vian on vi.362; and 567-71n.]. Cassandra here is on the stage, and grabs the sacrificial axe from the hearth outside the palace-front, or from indoors: cf. 525-585n. λυγροῦ ... ἵππου : 441n. ἐπεμαίετο : 'made for'; Gow on Theoc. 23.57. Ctr. E 748, Θ 392 ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ' ἵππους / : for the hiatus of. i.624, and Vian, Rech. 218.

572

καὶ ἀμφαδόν : so καὶ ἀμφαδήν N 356(v.1. — ἰή), A.R. 1.475; καὶ — ἰή ii.86. ἀμφαδὸν ἀθρήσω : cf. iii.599, x.465.

573

ἀπὸ νόβφι βαλόντες : see 215n., and for the active verb xiv.284-5.

574

πῦρ ὀλοόν ... : πῦρ ὀλοόν heads the verse at vii.43, viii.244, ix.99, and so N 629, A.R. 3.1301, Paul. Sil. AP 5.288.3 [Viansino 46].

574-5

ἐντύνοντο / δαῖτα : cf. ρ 175, and, in reverse, γ 33, ρ 182; A.R. 1.354.

575

μάλα γάρ τ' ῥά : iii.514 ῥά .. τάχ' ἤλυθε κυανέῃ νύξ / [cf. δ 429, 574] suggests either ῥά (Rhodomann, cf. ii.344, vii.492, viii.428; μάλα would refer to night pressing, being imminent) or τάχ' (Vian). ὑστέρῃ νύξ : the same

phrase in Triph. 377 ὁβρατίην...νύκτα / (speech of Cassandra).

576

Ἀργεῖοι ... ἐγὴθέον : 157n. εἰβάζοντες : 121n.

577

ὁμαδον : Q. is probably thinking in terms of ὁμοῦ ἀνδρῶν (cf. Ebeling s.v.); cf. xiii. 3. κατὰ Ἴλιον = Θ 131; cf. vi. 193. οὐδ' ἀλέγοντων : as Π 388, Hes. Op. 251 ὄκ - οντες /, τ 154 - ούεας /.

578

αὐτοί (v.l.) : cf. iv. 273. ἐθάμβεον : it is the turn of the Trojan women to do so in xiv. 396. ὥς ἐτέτυκτο : δ 772al.; again in [Orph.] A. 934.

579

ἀτρεκέως εἰδύη : cf. Crates HE 1374, Opp. Hal. 3.91, SEG 18.137(b)9 (Corinth, iip). The verb precedes in v. 136 ~ [Theoc.] 25.170, Opp. Hal. 5.103-4, Nonn. Met. 9.131-2. νόον καὶ μήτιν = H 447.

580-4

There does not seem to be an exact parallel in archaic epic (see Fehling 145f.) for the structure of ἄτε ... ἐββυτ' βέροντ' ὥς ... ἀπέββυτο.

580

ἦ δ' ἄτε πόρδαλις : Colluth. 41-2 / ἦ δ' ἄτε ... / πόρτις. Cf. 538n.

πόρδαλις : cf. Φ 573 / ἦν τε πόρδαλις ... (Ar. vulg. : v.l. πόρδ-, cf. M. van der Valk, Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad, Leiden 1964, 2.177f.)

~ i. 540f., iii. 201f. πόρδ- is offered by codd. i. 480, v. 248, x. 183, πόρδ- here, πόρδ- πόρδ- variants i. 541, iii. 202, v. 19. πόρδ- should probably be written throughout : cf. GVI 913a5 (ivp), Nonn. D. πόρδ- (πόρδ- appears seldom in the paradosis : 44.32, 48.1). ἐν σῦρεβιν : Δ 455 etc. ἀβχαλίσωα : 493n. καρχαλ - ὥα codd. may be just a slip, but a scribe may have remembered xiv. 397.

581

ἀπὸ μεββύλοιο : a clausula in Λ 548, in a simile which furnishes much of the basic material here; cf. also P 108f., 657 ~ vii. 486f. ἀπὸ σταθμοῦ κύνες μογεροί τε νομῆες [P 65 κύνες τ' ἄνδρες τε νομῆες /] / κάρτεϊ καὶ φωνῇ .. βέουσι λέοντας / πάντοθεν ἐβούμενοι ...; Claud. Ruf. 2.252f. μογεροί :

419n.; cf. xiii.74 $\sigma\theta$ δημάντορος. In Nic. Ther. 823, Arch. GPh 3761, Agath. AP 6.167.6 of fishermen; in Arat. 419 of sailors.

582

δελόντ' ἐββυμένως : not an Homeric jingle, though he has a number like it (Rank 29f.; Fehling 160). It is more masked in A.R. 2.538, 540 ἐββυμένως.... / δελόντ'; Opp. Hal. 4.617 / ἐββυμένως .. ἐπέββυτο. ἦ δ' ... ἔχουσα is a common pattern in archaic epic (cf. here hHom. 27.9 ἦ δ' ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχουσα /) and is widespread in the post-Hellenistic hexameter: cf. i.541; i.726 (γυναιμάνες ~ Man. 5.166 ἀειθλάνες); iii.74; iv.500 (μεμελημένον cf. GVI 2022.12 [Bithynia, i-ii]; Man. 2.241, 4.315; [Orph.] H. pr. 43). ἄγριον ἦτορ ἔχουσα: Agath. AP 5.289.3 [Viansino 89] / ἄγριον ἦτορ ἔχει; ἄγριον ἦτορ / (lion) v.407 ~ Opp. Hal. 2.339, 5.228, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.370+2.

583

ἐντροπαλίσομένη ἀναχάσεται: cf. P 108-9; Nonn. 32.265-6, 42.57. ἐχνομένη κῆρ = L 773; xiv.260, 289. For an amusing (and devastating) assault on the many attempts to tamper with the text here and at 584-5 see Platt 129.

584

εὐρέος ἵππου: 44n. τειρομένη περ: 372n.

585

ἄμφι φόνω: cf. xiii.358 / ψήθεεν ἄμφι φόνω; Π 647 ἄμφι φόνω Πατρόκλου μερμηρίσων. μάλα ... πῆμα: 49, 232nn.; cf. viii.454. δέχνυτο: also iii.755, x.152, xiii.285corr. This verb is neither (Page-Gow on GPh 3517) 'late' (Call. F746, then Parth. F4) nor 'rare' (I count in post-Alexandrine verse outside Q., compounds excluded, a round 100 examples, 52 of them in the two poems of Nonnos).

NOTES TO COMMENTARY

1

So, e.g., Kehmptzow 68.

2

See 21-65n.

3

Noack(811) astonishingly argues that it cannot be based on a version which made Calchas actually suggest the Horse, because we are dealing with a story put into Sinon's mouth.

4

Kullmann 221f. For Q. himself see Duckworth 66, and id. 75f. on the sharpening and intensification of the theme of Troy's imminent doom from this episode on.

5

Cf. I. Löffler, Die Melampodie, Meisenheim 1963, 24, 46.

6

See Heinze 65f.

7

Stubbe 32f. He naïvely posits as a source 'ein mythographisches Handbuch'.

8

Cf. G. L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis, London 1969, 139.

9

Lit. in B. Fenik, Iliad X and the Rhesus, Brussels 1964, 12.2.

10

Monotonous they may be (cf. Duckworth, TAPhA 98, 1967, 77f.), but they are not subliterate. Of the latter category in imperial times καὶ ῥαδὸν ἐστὶν εἰεῖσθαι.

11

See in general A. Bouché-Leclercq, L'Astrologie grecque, Paris 1899, esp. 551 et circa; Schoemann-Lipsius, Griechische Alterthümer, Berlin 1902, 292f.

12

W. Kullmann, Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias, Berlin 1956, 90f.

13

H.D.Jocelyn, The Tragedies of Ennius, Cambridge 1967, 326-7. Note however S.OT 301, where Teiresias [the 'star-man'] is vaguely credited with an interest in $\sigma\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$.

14

Cf. Heinze 65. Odyssean accounts of the Horse are eclectic and subject as one would expect to manipulation: Andersen, SO 52, 1977, 5f.

15

A. Severyns, Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque, Liège 1928, 355, guesses that Odysseus played the dominant rôle.

16

Q. certainly read Sophocles' play: but whether he would have found it appetizing is another matter. I agree with R. Carden, The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles, Berlin 1974, 107, that a prose mythographos is hardly likely to have supplied Q. with much detail on character-drawing. At the same time, Q. had plenty of material of a kindred nature to draw upon: the kind of drivel marketed by Diotys (cf. his sententious Neoptolemos, 4.15-16) or the rhetors ($\eta\theta\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\lambda\iota$: 'how do you think Neoptolemos would have reacted to Odysseus' suggestion that he should play a trick on Philoctetes?' [sub-Homeric verse efforts must have been rampant in the imperial epoch, cf. Parsons in POxy. 42, 1974, 13]; $\epsilon\kappa\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ taking account of $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$; $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ etc.). And draw upon them he certainly did, for the poem is a Digest that could only have appealed to a world nourished on commonplace rather than vibrant poetic creativity (cf. W.B. Stanford, The Ulysses Theme, Oxford 1963², 149). It is clear that Q. had dipped deeply into his vast poetic heritage; but how deeply he did so, we are not in much of a position to say: a florid turn of phrase, even if it can be paralleled in verse, does not necessarily indicate a poetic source, cf. W. Schmid's Atticismus, esp. 4.660f.

17

Cf. Vian, Notice to vii, 103-4.

18

Cf. Vian, Notice to xii, 83f.

19

See on these K. Rüter, Odysseeinterpretationen, Hypomnem. 19, Göttingen 1969, 250.

20

Of course reflection after the event that Troy was taken not by force of arms but by treachery is commonplace: e.g. Turnus in Virg. A. 9.152-3, the chorus in Sen. Ag. 614f.

21

See H. Frankel, De Simia Rhodio, Diss. Göttingen 1915, 68.

22

Noack, *passim*, ever anxious to establish innovation, crudely appeals to stock scenes—the stuff of epic—as definitive proof that Q. is giving free rein to his imagination.

23

On these cf. Arend 61f.; J. Hundt, Der Traumglaube bei Homer, Greifswald 1935, *passim*; Björck, Eranos 44, 1946, 306f.

24

A number of the Roman examples mentioned here are assembled in J. B. Stearns, Studies of the Dream as a Technical Device in Latin Epic and Drama, Diss. Princeton 1927, 21.65.

25

Cf. recently West, Gnomon 42, 1970, 660.

26

See Pease on Virg. A. 4.528.

27

Cf. Kost on Musae. 232-3.

28

See Robert 1227.1.

29

Follet (181) seems to me to skip past the difficulty.

30

One may compare v.344 [eagle devouring liver of Prometheus] κατὰ νηδύος
 ἐνδοθὶ βαίνων : δύνων Koechly, cf. λ 579, but βαίνων is more vigorous.
 Spitzner's ἀφ' ὧν ἐν φρεσὶ θείναι simply cuts the knot. — Vian* suggests
 δύναι here; βήναι is certainly odd, but so is the whole context.

31

Discussion and bibliography in M. von Albrecht, Silius Italicus, Amsterdam 1964,
 58f.

32

128 sounds slick by Q.'s standards, 129 contains an unusual conceit: Alexandrine?

33

Literary and artistic treatments of Horse plus paraphernalia are conveniently
 assembled by Yalouris, MH 7, 1950, 65f.

34

On this see Noack, 786.1.

35

Cf. Knight 114f.

36

Postgate on Lucan 7.198f.

37

Heinze(53f.) deals with this passage in his usual masterly fashion.

38

RE 24.1287.13f.

39

Noack(786.2) absurdly imagines Q. piecing together his Theomachy from pieces
 of Il. — and not only his Theomachy: 'x and y passages of Il./Od. would
 suffice...' constitutes a formula¹ in this paper.

40

F. Vian, La guerre des Géants, Paris 1952, 1.

41

After Ennius? Cf. von Albrecht(op.cit.fn.31), 152f.

42

Ctr.vi.422(Eurypylus loq.) ἡ ἐρσέντος Ὀλύμπου/, which has given rise to a host of conjectures. The gods live in a colony on the peak of Olympus, and that peak is situated in a zone above the clouds: cf. Lehrs 163f. and more recently M. Schmidt, Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias, Zetem. 62, Munich 1976, 75f. Eurypylus may simply be viewing Olympus from his own standpoint on earth: cf. πυκλινόν νέφος in E 751. There is a useful discussion of ἄρ etc. in Homer by Louis, RPh 74, 1948, 63f.

43

Stesich. Il. Pers., SLG 88. The speech contained in the first column is extremely hard to decipher. I am not in a position to quarrel with Barrett's join of 1+47; but I note that col. i possesses elements reminiscent of Odysseus' exhortation: 6-7 cf. Triph. 122; 7 cf. Q. 229; 16, 18 cf. Q. 224-5; the speaker (presumably) is endowed with πινυτλ, 24.

44

Cf. R. Oehler, Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung, Diss. Basel, 1925, 22f.

45

Some examples in O. Falter, Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern, Würzburg 1934, 43.

46

On this and comparable scenes cf. West's commentary, with Verdenius, Mnemosyne 25, 1972, 225f.; A. Kambylis, Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik, Heidelberg 1965, esp. 31f., 69f.

47

On which see Luppe, Philologus 120, 1976, 186f.

48

A. D. Skiadas, Homer im griechischen Epigramm, Athens 1965, 24f.

49

Cf. C. Vellay, Les légendes du cycle Troyen, Monaco 1957, (i) 295.

On elaboration of various kinds in catalogues see G.Strasburger, Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias, Diss.Stuttgart 1954, 20f.

Greeks and Romans.

For Q. the bibliographies in Vian, Rech. 95f.; V.Buchheit, Vergil über die Sendung Roms, Heidelberg 1963, 193f.; Leone, Vichiana 5, 1968, 59f. (an article of no independent worth) should be sufficient to satisfy the most demanding appetite. For the now fashionable trio Q.-Triph.-Nonn. consult D'Ippolito, Studi Nonniani, Palermo 1964, 69f.; Cameron, Historia 14, 1965, 494f. and Claudian, Oxford 1970, 20; J.Diggle, Euripides' Phaethon, 199. Within the limits of the present commentary I must content myself with a detailed examination of the Sinon and Laocoon episodes and leave consideration of other alleged borrowings for another occasion. [Tempest in xiv: see now L.J.Tarrant, Seneca: Agamemnon, Cambridge 1976, 22f., who comes out against Senecan influence: characteristic Senecan colores are absent in Q.]. — I mention Triph. from time to time in the commentary. This strange poem is in urgent need of reexamination: papers such as Cesareo's (see my bibliography) are shameless specimens of the purely assertive approach and the sloppiness which dog the whole topic. — D'Ippolito has argued strongly and ~~personally~~ eloquently for Nonnian use of Ovid's Metamorphoses. But we should not lie back in comfortable security: it is easy to laugh at a putative 'Hellenistic source' (so Diggle, above) but not so easy to shake off the plain fact that Hellenistic mannerisms assail the reader at every turn (cf. Lloyd-Jones, CR n.s. 21, 1971, 345; for some instructive Hellenistic models in Nonnos see now the excellent paper of Hollis, CQ n.s. 26, 1976, 142f.). It is noteworthy that even ardent supporters of Ovidian borrowing appear to feel themselves bound to keep the alleged borrowing within strictly defined limits: cf. e.g. Keydell, Gnomon 38, 1966, 26f.

If one may state with confidence that, e.g., Melinno's Hymn to Rome owes nothing to Roman poets (Usener, RhM 55, 1900, 290 et al.; R.Mellor, CEA *PLMH*

[Hypomnem.42], Göttingen 1975, 121f.) or that Musaeus was not indebted to Ovid in the slightest degree for his highly divergent (and flat) account of Hero and Leander (Kost, Einleitung to Musae., p. 21), a major area still largely unexplored from this point of view is the Greek epigram: GPh in particular is in need of thorough investigation, cf. Griffiths, JHS 90, 1970, 217. On Crinagoras see Keydell, Gnomon 43, 1971, 679, on others id. Hermes 80, 1952, 497f. — Cyrus AP 9.136 ~ Virg. (?) : Luck, Gnomon 33, 1961, 781. — Agathias & co.: Agath. AP 7.612 ~ Martial 11.13 (?) : Weinreich, SHAW i. 1944-8, 71: ctr. Averil Cameron, Agathias, Oxford 1970, 23.1, Alan Cameron, Porphyrius the Charioteer, Oxford 1973, 88.1; Paul. Sil. AP 5.275 ~ Prop. 1.3 (?) : E. Schulz-Vanheyden, Properz und das griech. Epigramm, Diss. Münster 1969, 156f., Kenney CR n.s. 22, 1972, 111: ctr. Averil Cameron, JHS 86, 1966, 211; Lyne, PCPhS 196, 1970, 60.2, Skutsch, CQ n.s. 23, 1973, 317. The above is a representative collection. It seems unrealistic to hope for any solid advances until someone takes the step of first clearing the ground by draining, on the widest possible basis, his chosen epigrammatist of what is demonstrably Greek, and then examining any residue there might be in the light of a systematic reading of most categories of Roman verse.

52

In what follows we must leave aside Sophocles' Sinon, about which we know next to nothing; and Il. Parv.: evidence for Sinon's activities is ultimately based solely on Tab. Il., for the passage of Aristotle's Poetics which mentions a Sinon based on Il. Parv. (1459b4f.) cannot possibly be genuine (see Lucas ad loc.) and it is in any case by no means clear that actual plays are referred to (cf. Baldry, CQ n.s. 4, 1954, 152). Tz. on Lyc. 344 is the poorest kind of testimony to invoke: 'the Trojans ~~were~~ were taken in by Sinon, admitted the Horse, feasted, and fell asleep: and Sinon $\phi\rho\upsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \omega\varsigma\ \delta\ \lambda\epsilon\beta\chi\eta\varsigma\ \phi\eta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \eta\upsilon\nu\iota\kappa\alpha\ \nu\upsilon\zeta\ \mu\epsilon\tau\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\ \mu\epsilon\beta\beta\eta\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ '. The whole note on 344 is a jumble (e.g., line 14, where a verse of Triph.'s is interjected, closely followed by a paraphrase of Lyc.'s text), and the citation of Lesches' famous line (see Il. Parv. F12 Allen), which Tz. was bound to mention, and which he had

used twice himself in his own gruesome Posthomerica, is no proof at all that the moon was mentioned by Lesches in connexion with Sinon (ctr. Tz. Posth. 720f.) — far less that Sinon had previously fooled the Trojans. It is well known that Tab. Il. is not by any means accurate in all that it portrays (cf. C.M. Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry, Oxford 1961², 106), and against its testimony may be set the fact that the summary of Il. Parv. fails to mention these alleged activities prior to the Horse's entry. It reads (233f.): οἱ δὲ Τρῶες τῶν κακῶν ἐπολαβόντες ἀπηλλοχθαι τὸν τε δούρειον ἵππον εἰς τὴν πόλιν εἰσδέχονται, which reminds one most of all of the picture painted in E. Tr. 521f.: Sinon does not appear; the people of Troy almost will the Horse to enter, exclaiming ἴτ' ὦ παυμένοι πόλιν ... Indeed, in Il. Parv. Sinon's rôle had been assumed already by Odysseus, who penetrated the city and arranged its capture (226) with Helen (224f., cf. schol. θ 256). The 'conference' must surely have settled the problem of the flare: Helen lights a flare in Virg. A. 6.518f., Triph. 512f. (the ineptitude of the latter in assigning an identical task to Sinon is wholly characteristic). — Vian* however does not share my scepticism about the worth of Tab. Il.

53

Perhaps Liv. Andr. should be added: cf. below, § 3(b)(ii).

54

Cf. Vian, Notice 74.

55

'Vergil seems to find in Sinon a kind of Punica fides', Knight 69; cf. Jones, CJ 61, 1965, 128. Robertson, GRBS 11, 1970, 25 labels Sinon an 'anti-hero', by which he is referring, one hopes, to V.'s Sinon.

56

See e.g. Robert 1232; Ter Vrugt-Lentz, Mnemosyne 4.20, 1967, 168.3.

57

The schol.'s description (on 245) of Odysseus as πλεγυλὸς κερτερήϊος ἑπὲρ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων might well be applied to our Sinon.

58

O. Ribbeck, Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik, Leipzig 1875, 410f.

59

Cf. Heinze 9; Austin on A.2.78. No doubt Accius' Philocteta is relevant here: but I cannot take seriously the contention of M. Wigodsky, Vergil and Early Latin Poetry, Hermes Einzelschr. 24, 1972, 88, that this play was 'Vergil's source for Sinon' tout court; cf. id. 95 for a curious mode of argumentation designed to discount direct Sophoclean influence.

60

S. Stabryla, Latin Tragedy in Virgil's Poetry, Warsaw 1970, 94.

61

So E. Fraenkel, Plautinisches im Plautus, Berlin 1922, 344.

62

G. Highet, The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid, Princeton 1972, 16f.

63

That of Q. cannot be so called by any stretch of the imagination. Duckworth's arguments (78, 86) for the opposite point of view are little short of astonishing.

64

Cf., on a more generalised level, Knight 56f.

65

For his language here cf. 375n.; iv. 34-5; Hector in Rhesus 53f.; and not least

θ 500-502 ἐπὶ νηῶν / βάντες ἀπέπλεον ... / Ἀργεῖοι.

66

For Cesareo (268) there is a 'corrispondenza sostanziale' between this verse and A.2.25, 'φένγειν = abiisse, καί = et; vento petiisse... con lieve variante è riprodotto da ἐλκέμεν ecc.' There are a further 69 pages, all in like vein.

67

On this partnership see Pokrowsky, CRASR 7, 1930, 117f.

68

Cf. Stanford, op. cit. in fn. 16, 111.

69

Some stern criticism in Keydell, 1931, 75.

70

See Bassett, AJPh 46, 1925, 244.1—but he made nothing of the point.

71

It is just possible that ἐρυσίπτολις here is meant to be ambiguous; cf. Call. F 626 with Pfeiffer's note.

72

Certainly not S.'s Laocoon—unless we are dealing with a conglomerate.

73

Keydell (283) accepts use of Nicander but does his best to stave off other possible interests. Why should one? Q. lived in antiquity, and was not quite as starved as we are.

74

RhM 46, 1891, 522f.

75

Kleinknecht's point that the arx constitutes a Leitmotiv in A.2 ~~78.2~~ (p. 78.2) is very true; but this observation does not go any way towards removing the unnaturalness of this particular train of events.

76

κατακοντιγμός πρὸ τῆς πόλεως of the Equus October? See G. Dumézil, Hommages à Marie Delcourt, Coll. Latomus 114, Brussels 1970, 202f.

77

See e.g. Kleinknecht 104.

78

A precise clinical description would not be out of tune with Sophoclean methods: cf. Collinge, BICS 9, 1962, 46f.

79

On A.R. see Solmsen, MH 18, 1961, 195f.; in general: Erbse, Hermes 81, 1953, 189f.

80

But maybe this is not a serious parallel: Eumolpus could be hastily lumping together Sinon and Trojan folly [~ Virg. A. 2.54 et al.], throwing in the inscription for good measure, in order to get on to the pièce de résistance—Laocoon & sons.

81

E.g. Vian, Rech. 67; Austin A.2, p.94.

82

Cf. Heinze 69.

83

So Kleinknecht 105; Vian, Notice 76.

84

Cf. Robert I218.

85

⊖ 548, 550-2, cited by Vian, Notice 83.3 seem better left out of the question.

One may compare the Sophoclean story of the actual departure of the gods (details in Austin on Virg. A.2.351).

86

On this see in general Vian, Rech. 69-70. I have not considered it necessary to overload the commentary with parallels for all these phenomena: most are hackneyed.

87

Omen-lists in Greek verse are thin on the ground. (i) Brief lists: Colluth. 205f. [cf. West, Gnomon 42, 1970, 660]; hDion., GDK 56.1f., miraculous devastation of countryside, is perhaps worthy of inclusion; disjunctive list in simile, in Homeric style: A.R.4.1280f., the influence of which on Q. is surely exaggerated by Vian, cf. earlier Pi. Paeon 9.13f. — Teiresias' musings on his mantic activities in S. Ant. 1005f., though containing a sequence that offers interesting points of similarity with Q. (1007f. ~ 503f.) hardly constituted a portent-list (one may agree with Keydell, 282, on this much at least); for S. cf. Stat. Theb. 10.598f. (ii) Nonnos indulges in lengthier exercises: (a) 38.16f. εἴματα ... / φαίνεται, θάμβος ἄπιπτον (Roman?) ~ 30 τρόμος-reaction (Roman? Cf. Jocelyn, Trag. Linn. pp. 221-2); 19 cf. Lucan 1.540f. (and Virg. G. 4.467?). However, much here is filched from A.R.4.1280f. (b) 44.6f. (21 αὐτομάτοι κληῖδες λυγροὶ γυναικῶν, 39 ἐκλείψεται βωμός, 44 / δειμα φέρων, 45 ἐρρεε λυθρῶν /). (c) 45.325f.

88

Cf. Vian, Rech. 71.

89

L. Ferrari, Osservazioni su Quinto Smirneo, Luxograph-Palermo 1963, 51 finds Q.'s account of Cassandra 'poeticamente felice', but (thankfully) refrains from telling us why.

90

Davreux 132f.; in fig. 30 a Trojan is in the act of disarming her: cf. Q. 573f.

91

See e.g. Wilson, Gnomon 38, 1966, 340, on tragedy.

92

In the Cypria Helenos and Cassandra prophesy when Paris is about to set sail for Sparta (91f.), as in $\langle \text{Arctinus} \rightarrow \rangle$ [Apollod.] Cassandra and Laocoon combine against the Horse. Dracontius paints Helenos in the colours of Virg.'s Laocoon (cf. 120 procul exclamat, and his speech). Cassandra follows hot on his heels with a speech which follows the same line of argument (134f.): but she adds details of her own rape, Hecuba, Astyanax, Priam, Andromache, which will go back to Ennius (cf. the references to Hector ~ Enn. Alexandr. 69f.) and ultimately to Euripides. Triph. makes his Cassandra predict her own fate and that of her father, mother and Polyxena (398f.); cf. Lyc. 314f.

93

Noack, Hermes 27, 1892, 451f., expertly juxtaposes similar passages in Q. and Triph., but does not begin to face up to the differences even in fixed aspects of the Cassandra story.

INDEXES

A

I Quintus.

(i) Composition.

Compressed, summarizing style: 144; 353-9; resulting in lack of realism 368; cf. 21-65; 372. Inconsistencies or patchiness in narration: 1-2; 46; 337; 338-344; cf. 87; 500-524. Gnomica: 388.

(ii) Q. and Homer.

Q. is a poeta doctus to the extent that he treats Homer very much in the spirit of Apollonius, though obviously on a less rigorous intellectual level. In both many individual components are taken over verbatim; but much more is toyed with. A sample:-

(a) Units shift metrical location: 2, 52, 67f., 229, 320, 493, 529. (b) Two or more units are fused into a new whole, sometimes with slight modification of individual parts: 2(vii.112), 48, 75-6, 138, 145, 158, 231, 244, 259, 260, 275, 280, 304, 314(!), 327, 378, 427, 528, 559; cf. 2(Hom.+Hes.), 178(H.Hom.+A.R.?), 247(Il.+A.R.?).
 — The reader is assailed by a battery of Homeric: 107f., 146-7, 154, 156, 204, 235-6, 271, 290, 421, 557. (c) ab → ba: 25, 32-3, 49, 58, 61, 67f., 144, 155-6, 170-1, 181, 181-2, 221, 242, 263, 361, 366-7, 390-1, 444, 496-7(hAp.), 525. (d) Above all, juggling and jingling with Homeric prototypes. (i) Termination of verb/noun altered, at times with further substitutions or metrical shifts: 1(x.18), 24(iv.592), 27, 56-7, 79, 125, 136(hAphr.), 141, 153, 203, 285, 391, 414, 487-8, 503 (hHerm.), 547, 571. (ii) Other jingles: 6, 16, 53, 95, 127, 176, 207, 251, 369, 396, 412, 438, 481, 482, 542-3, 556.

(iii) Language.

(a) Vocabulary.

Essential to view Q. in relation to imperial poetry, cf. Greek Index s.(e.g.)

λέωνος αἰγλήεις ἀκρόμενος ἀμφορος δέχνηται δολόφρων εὐταλὴς ἱερὸν /
 κλυτὸν Ὀλβιον ἄλκυ κινύρεσθαι κύδιμος μογερός ὀβριμόθυμος παρθενικός
 Τρῳίος ἐπερθύμος [400] χρημέθειν ; and to exhibit caution in labelling items
 'recherché' rather than products of the pool of imperial output: e.g.s. Ἀἰδωνεύ
 εἶνεσθαι θεῇ μαρμαίρειν παρὰ πτεῖς τεράτα χυλὸν πρὸ χυλῶς.

The 'plain style' may be discerned in the mass of colourless noun-epithet combinations (see e.g. s. αἶνός τε καίματος ἀπειρέσιος ἐβόλῃς ἤνυσ μέγας βροντοίης) and general avoidance of Homeric 'glosses' (a long recognised phenomenon; see e.g. 154 on γλαυκῶπις ; 267 on ἀμφιελίββης ; 429 on ἀτρύγετος); exceptions may turn out in many cases to be only apparent (e.g. κητώεις μεγακήτης: force of tradition?).

Q. 1, now known to have composed a Christian poem himself, has many points of contact with Christian versifiers (see Index of Authors s. Gr. Naz., Nonn. Met., [Apolinarius]). It is relevant to wonder whether the Posthomerica for its part substantially reflects elements derived from contemporary or earlier Christian verse.

(b) Formulaic style.

Cf. esp. on 66, 131, 183, 318, 322. Builds up systems much in the Homeric manner: e.g. 18, noun-epithet + variation of terminal verb. Replaces Homeric with comparable units: e.g. 129, 165, 214, 247, 288; cf. 45 (Τρώων νῆες : but Τρώων νῆες with formulaic repetition), 74, 174-5. Ignores in general the law of economy: see esp. 26.

(iv) Sources.

Prosaic/digest material: cf. esp. 306-335(A), 500-524; fn. 16. Alexandrine influences: esp. 389-417, cf. 399-415, 449-50; cf. s. Apollonius Rhodius, Nicander.

(v) Res Romanae.

See esp. s. Virgil; bibliogr.: fn. 51. It is possible to compile a list of individual phenomena exhibiting similarities with Roman poets: see esp. 1, 5, 66, 90, 104-121, 129, 160, 193, 254, 500-524, 530-3; but of course one could equally well compile such a list from, say, A.R. or Call.

II Epica.

Allegorical War-Spirits: 437-8. Anachronisms: 90. Astrology in epic: 5.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ , a tag: 139.

Catalogues: 306-335(B), 315-6; aspects of language and technique: 306, 307, 314, 316, 317, 322, 323; cut short: 327.

'Foreshadowing': fn. 4.

Gnomae in epic:388. Gods and men:373.

μητις, appeals for in A.R.:9. Muse-invocations:306-335(A). Myth-manipulation:260-305.

Omen-lists:500-524.

Repetition in epici:521-2.

Ships, Achaean ships in Homer and Q.:10. Similes:major:409-10,489f.,489-90,530-3,580,581;short comparisons:'like a νόημα':202;'like a πέτρη':365-6. Speech:direct speech circumvented:120;narrative material incorporated in speech:55-8;introductory and concluding formulae:254,551a;short speeches in Il./Od.:152-157.

Theomachies etc.:157-218(A). Typical scenes and situations:-(i)Arming:303-4;Assembly:3-7cf.4-7;Chariots for journey:191-5;Dreams and visions:104-21cf.107f.;ἐκφράσεις, aspects of:146,150,449-50;Exhortation to troops:218-259;Gods warn of Zeus' anger:157-218(B);Journeys by ship:345f.;ἰαχῆ-reaction:415;Noise:reaches heaven 178 and hell 157-218(A),180,localities respond to noise of god 180-3cf.176-7;Portents:12-18,447-8,449f.;Reversals(καί'νύκερ sim.):93-4,395;Speeches in games:152-157;Thunder of Zeus:93-100;τις (i.q. πᾶς τις) routines:254;Treachery, heroic distaste for:66-103;Woodcutting:122-156(A). (ii)Recurrent scenes in Q.:281f.,347-8,360-88 §3(a),397-8,405-6,457-8,514-6.

Zeitangaben:104-121,117.

III Mythologica.

Achilles:would have opposed Horse:66-103;unable to take Troy:77-8;blond hair:274;'heroism':287f.;ἀκλμάτως impiger:77;'divine','godlike':288. Apollo:and Troy:1-20,389-417 §4(i);his temple there:481. Ares:and Athene combatants 157-218(A);dancer?:172. Athene:and:-Horse:104-121;Troy:360-388 §4(a)(iii),438-9;blinding:389-417 §2;σπλκοντες:389-417 §4(i);'martial' punisher:377;and Ares combatants:157-218(A).

Calchas:and Horse:1-20,1-2;and Odysseus:360-388 §4(a)(ii);astrologer:5.

Calydna:452. Cassandra:525-585cf.500-524,527;traditional elements in Q.:525,526-8,529-30,530-8,534,535-9,539,540-51,544-5,552,553-7,554,555,556,563,575.

Doublets in Trojan saga:1-2 with fn.9.

Enyo and sim.:437-8. Epeius:21-65,83,104-121,329;'unwarlike':108. 璽

Helenos:1-20,1-2. Hera:373,438-9. Horse:esp.1-20,21-65,104-121,122-156A-B;
also 124(material for),145(mobility of parts),147(duration of building),237
and 386(inscription on),332-3(κλῖμακες),334-5('silent' occupants),443 cf.
353-359(dimensions of),389-417 §1(debate over),and 567-71,571(suggested methods
of destruction),423f. and 428(~ ship),424-7(wheels for),434-5(crowned),441-3
(Trojan reaction to entry),543(= 'Ὀλεθρὸς ??),fn.14(in Homer); epithets: δουράτεος
/ δουρίος :110 and 139; εὐξοος :224; εὐρύς 44; κητώεις :314; μεγακήτης :151;
πολυχανδής :264; ψηλός :142. Huts, burning of:337.

Ialmenos:322. Ida:122-56(A),122-3,128. Idomeneus:320. Iris:191-5,193.

Laocoon:esp.389-417;also 21-65,476-7,560; ~Cassandra:525-585 Excursus cf.
560-1(?).

Neoptolemos:'sacker' of Troy:12-18;opposes Horse:66-103;in Soph. ~Q.:ibid.;
name:279;father's double:287f.;in catalogue:315. Nestor:260-305,338-344.

Oceanus host of gods:160-1. Odysseus:and Horse:1-20,21-65,23,218-259;versus
Neoptolemos:66-103,68-9;attitude to δόλος :229f.;+ Calchas:360-388 §4(a)(ii);
sacrificer:360-388 §4(a)(iv).

Palladium:360-388 §4(a)(iii).

Simois:459-60. Sinon:esp.360-388;also 41('beggar'),53cf.238(~Odysseus),
218-59(volunteers),238(implausible story-line),251-2(in Q.,Virg. & Triph.),
345(signal),360(mutilation),361-2(treatment by Trojans). Stenelus:opposes
Horse:66-103.

Tab.II.,Sinon in:fn.52. Tenedos:345,452. Tethys' cave:160. Themis as
peacemaker:157-218(B). Troy:'holy':351;walls breached for Horse:440-1.

Typhon:451-2.

Winds: ~ horses:191-5;cardinal winds in poetry:192.

Xanthos,R.:459-60.

IV Miscellaneous.

Asyndeton in portent stories:12.

Corruptions and variants:contamination from neighbouring line:passim,esp.^s220.

ἀγερ—ἀγρ—:7; ἀλλοις λαοῖς ? :342; μείνονα ἀμύμονα :231; ἀταλὰ φρον ἀταλό—:

107; $\delta^2 \sim \tau^2 / \rho^2$? : 33; $\delta\alpha\lambda - \chi\alpha\lambda -$: 15; $-\epsilon\iota - \epsilon\tau^2$: 104; $\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu \epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\iota\tau\omicron\nu$: 91; $\theta\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma - \epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma$: 264; $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma - \acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\varsigma - \acute{\omega}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$: 58; $\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota, \mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$: 532; $-\omicron\iota\iota - \eta\epsilon\iota$: 195, 200; $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\tau\alpha\iota - \pi\epsilon\acute{\lambda}\eta\tau\alpha\iota$: 42; $\pi\iota\phi\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\delta\kappa - \pi\iota\phi\acute{\alpha}\delta\kappa -$: 39; $\pi\acute{o}\rho\delta - \pi\alpha\rho\delta -$: 580; $\rho^2 \delta^2$: 37; $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi - \epsilon\tau\rho\epsilon\phi -$: 104; $\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu - \epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu -$ 539 cf. 495.

Epanalepsis: 393-4 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Middle for active: 435.

Preverb anticipating compound: 198-9. Prosody: a 'rogue' verse: 314; abridgement before $\omicron\iota^c$, + $\acute{\alpha}\pi\rho\eta\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon$: 53.

B

ANCIENT AUTHORS

This index is selective; but entries under Triphiodorus and Virgil are substantially complete.

§ Accius

Deiphobus F2-5: 360-88 § 3(b)(i)-(ii).

§ Aeschylus

Eu. 935f.: 543. Fr.: 157 codd.: 148; 183: 262; 488: 5; 883f.: 553-7. Th. 400-1: 105.

§ Aetna

61-2: 157-218(A).

§ Agathias

AP 5.287.5: 539; 289.3: 582.

§ Alcaeus, HE

20-1: 266.

§ Alcman, PMG

3.66-7: 104.

§ Alexander Aetolus, CA

3.33: 537.

§ Anonyma

(a) ep. CA 1.10a: 403; 2.67: 10; PSI 722.2: 74; POxy. 2883i.8 (Rhian.?): 75; PSchubart 6.29;

443; hDion. GDK 56.21, 24: 365-6.

(b) Trag. Adesp. 414N. (E.): 526-8.

(c)(i) AP 3.16.3: 67f.; 9.788.1-2: 194; AppAnth. 312.3p.343: 361-2; 'Simon.' EpGr

153 Page: 72. (ii) EpGr. Kaibel: 782.2: 190-1; 1050.1: 284. GES 78.10: 183. GVI:

439.4:183;740.3:15;756.5:4⁸9f.;1157.2:247;1502.5-6;485-6;1582.2:400;1593.2:
463;1843.7:183;1954.9:419;1991.5-6:485-6;2026.14:107;2088.5:489f. IG:
4(2)228.8:555. IME:22114:490;168.26:309. MAMA:1.319.3:486. SEG:18.137
(b)2:182.

(d)Comment.POxy.2812:389-417.

§ Antimachus

F 28.2:19-20.

§ Antipater of Sidon,HE

352:432;509:382.

§ Antipater of Thessalonica,GPh

469:296.

§ Antiphrilos,GPh

1002:48.

§ Anyte,HE

724-5:175-6.

§ [Apolinarius]

pr.53:46;4.7:311;11.4:51;37.15:313;47.2:65;47.14:289;48.12:305;58.6:62;58.23:
99;70.43:533;77.137:99;79.32,36:359;108.39:115;113.8,12:132;117.19:362;135.23:
76;151.16:142.

§ [Apollodorus]

5.16:353-359.

§ Apollonius Rhodius

Gnomae in:388.

CA F12.19:547.

Argon.:-

I: 27:181-2;39:209-10;45:472;238:88;274:534;323:260-305;324pap.:357;331:267;
350:374;367f.:423f.;388codd.:430;473:501;519:104;534:501;550-1:442-3;633f.:
353-359;640-1:123-4;816:371;858:46;910:173;920:168;996:449;1052:63;1064-5:
447-8;1103:526;1162:434.

II: 38:451-2;86:29³;137-8:443;156-7:500;246:417;271:375;316:277;407:537;538:
163;538,540:582;642:179;679-80:456;853:480-1;874:173;879:374;889:558;894:383;
917:216;1033-4:354;1052-3:77-8;1074:49;1103f.:514-6;1105:213;1106-7:474;

1175:503;1206:178;1285:349.

III: 45:366;145:526;176:348;196:122;274:134;522:120;555f.:66-103;565:24;581:209-10;615:242;676:556;681-2:555;720:9-10;761f.:389-417 § 2;763f.:406;766-7:350;891f.:55-8;891:417;1113:375;1256-7:465;1324:240;1379:354.

IV: 44:511;129:180;155:475;273-4:88-9,261;391-3:567-8;410:552;461:133;501-2:294-5;523:347-8;559-60:415;642:164-5;661-2:347-8;757:479;903-4:347-8;1058-9:104-121;1066-7:403;1208:228;1218:481;1280f.:fn.87;1298:489;1307:305;1333:379;1335:209-10;1364:447-8;1383:247;1397:11;1485:473-4;1565:306-7;1641f.:451;1666-7:96;1713:346;1720-1:568-9.

§ Aratus

18:308;64:33;87:313;243:209-10;411-12:55;443corr.:487:473:116;1003corr.:513;1036-7:5-6;1101-2:419.

§ Archilochus, IEG/SLG

31:535-6/478.13:112.

§ Aristophanes

Ec.674:209-10.

§ Aristotle

Po.1459b4f.:fn.52.

§ Bacchylides

F 20(B)11:440-1.

§ Bion

1.10:402;F8.5:171;F14.4:256.

§ Callimachus

Ap.6:511;Lav.Pall.75f.:389-417 § 2. F:-2:306-335(A);194.42:436;260.14suppl.:362;260.20:296;331:378;(?)727:346. — Fr.Anon.Schneider 112:458.

§ Carmen Aureum

71:114.

§ Cedrenus:

Hist.Comp.:131:500-524;132:360-388 § 4(a)(iii).

§ Certamen

140-1corr.?:306-7.

§ Christodorus

20 and 348:411;173f.:360-388 § 2(b);173-4:113;412:116.

§ Claudian

Gig.Gr.(2):passim:157-218(A);32:432.

Gig.Lat.:51al.:157-218(A). IVCons.557:274. Rapt.3.55f.:157-218(B). Ruf.1.226:530-3.

§ Cleanthes, CA

1.20:209-10.

§ Colluthus

1:459-60;7v.1.:410;41-2:580;70:165;177:72;205f.:fn.87;228-9:347-8;316:104-121;363corr.:495.

§ Cypria

F 11.4 Allen:183.

§ Demosthenes Bithynus, CA

4.3:89.

§ Dictys

§ 5:-7-8:500-524;7:1-20;9,11:1-20;11:424-7,441-3;12:345.

§ Dio Chrysostomus

Or.11:-21:360-388 § 4(a)(iii);123:353-359;128:525-585.

§ Dionysius Bassaricus

F 6(b)4:429;F 16:345.

§ Dionysius Periegeta

454:386;604:522;1076corr.:409.

§ Dioscorides, HE

1465:402.

§ Dracontius

Hel.:120f.:fn.92;183f.:527.

§ Empedocles

F 7.6:115;112.12suppl.:403.

§ Ennius

Alexand.33:555;41:540-551.

§ Eratosthenes, CA

16.14corr.:450.

§ Eudocia

Arg.Hom. 5:420. Cypr. 2.266:104.

§ Euphorion, CA

9.9:257;69:360-388 § 2(b);98.4corr.:179.

§ Euripides

HF 1065-6:495. Or. 322:58. Tr. 417:563;521f.:fn.52;525f.:237;537f.:423f.

F 1082N. (Alexandr.?):256.

§ Germanicus

AP 9.17.3:544.

§ Gregory of Nazianzus

Carm.:- 501.41:54;516.15:418;516.20:153;526.55:419;551.388:420;571.642corr.?:
555;591.163:479;672.70-1:335;768.37:361-2;984.188:ibid.;987.228:155-6;1003.
446:54;1242.185:246;1286.7:359;1320.180:70;1368.211:155-6;1372.267:202;1492.
173:155-6;1499.268:413;1504.331:70;1505.348:258;1513.99:54;1538.227:289;
1545.44:388;1548.77:555;1548.81:553-7;1566.201:533;1576.325:43;1576.326:322.

§ Hermesianax, CA

7.65:463.

§ Hesiod

Op. 14:90;16:384;20c.v.l.:61;147:338-9;289f.:292-6;433-4:299;444-5:115;570:
225-6;650:168;752:300.

Th. 22f.:306-335(A);22:308;69f.:176-7;114:308;167f.:243-253;175:47-8;211:
469;301-2:449-50;617f.:157-218(A);690-1:57;820f.:157-218(A);993:92.

§ [Hesiod]

Scutum 36:54;96:232;107~ 339:263;245:276;

F 22.4:319;35.10:339;198.3:171;211.5:91;280.23:540.

§ Homer

Il.

A 2:493;29:271;152:38;157:429;169c.v.l.:299;178:254;217:225-6;318:389;385:
4;436f.:345f.;444:361;501:569;573-4:207.

B 6f.:104-121;20:281;138:227-8;171:405;210:175-6;308:519-20;311f.:489f.;

320:359;333-4:174-5;400:138;437f.:234;465:32;484f.:306-335(A);512:322;649:327;833-4:445-6.

Γ 35v.1.:309;84:216;113:346;148:320;202:226;242:302;416v.1.:291.

Δ 81f.:254;299:293;300:385;313f.:260-305;321-2:271;470:359.

Ε 94:344;12⁵_κ6:465;230:153;445-6:482;649:487-8;661:570;670:534;699:301;720f.:191-5;748:571;778:187;867:481.

Ζ 4vulg.:459-60;161-2:85-6;168:529;235-6:174-5;261:232;286:439-40;343:362-3;389:411.

Η 7:349;214-5Ar.:157;220:194;289:247;427:334-5;436-7c.v.1.:509-10;447:579.

Θ 10Aristoph.:161;22:1 and 546;114:316;141-2:255;229:369;251:102;344:427;397f.:157-218(B);413:65.

Ι 58:391;89Ar.:71;242:568;305:556;348:79;428:426;446:272;592:184;594Zen.:237.

Κ 93-4:525;194f.:360-88 ^ρ3(a);290:414;299f.:360-88 ^ρ3(a);355:420;390:176 and 201.

Λ 49:304;88:125;190,205:67f.;227:290;263:524;548:581;614:402;633:366-7;733v.1.:78.

Μ 154:68;313:459;340vulg.:343;378:231;419:2.

Ν 13:181;18-19,18_α:176-7;29-30:457-8;319-20:568-9;551-2:361-2;568-9:42;691:138;692(Zen.):326;813c.v.1.:91.

Ξ 92:563;140-1:158;191:396;511v.1.:306-335(A).

Ο 123f.:157-218(B);123-4:202-3;168f.:157-218(B);223:378;280:384;411-12:81-3;461:189-90.

Π 100:440-1;157:241 and 533;209:525;302:2;436:250;600:253;624:76;689:67f.;713:88;849:556;852-3:564-5.

Ρ 111:532;131:290;232:290;287:440;377:327;409:189-90;625:200.

Σ 49:327;51:172;158:365;240:160;246-7:465-6;318:412;507:374;510:390-1;523-4:349;534:187.

Τ 36:304;122:48;195:11;404:193.

Υ 1f.:157-218(A);52:412;57-8:397-8;211:255;232:316;371-2:465.

Φ 24:244;59:270;266:394;309-10:227;493-4:13;572:88;576:532;583:298;586c.v.1.:

67f.

X 5:473-4; 54-5:559; 65:427; 70:396; 110c.v.l.:301; 247c.v.l.:387; 287:528; 422:493; 491v.l.:309.

Y 65f.:107f.; 109f.:122-56(A); 120v.l.:130; 626f.:260-305; 694v.l.:138; 769f.:152-7; 803:357.

Ω 100:334; 162:246; 331:189-90 and 382; 340-1:174-5; 481:231; 544v.l.:106; 700f.:529-30; 773:583.

—schol.:—

B 291:376; / 347:66-103.

Od.

α 1-2:171; 42-3:85-6; 58:354; 66:275; 143:343; 201:542-3; 234c.v.l.:300; 420:114.

β 66:488; 110:385; 200:557; 312:128.

γ 19:368; 24:284; 44:227-8; 56:299; 130_a:390; 134:335; 261:244; 297:395; 343:106; 414:316; 441:535; 445:383; 450:441.

δ 122:107f.; 150:141; 162:285; 243f.:360-88 §2(b); 261:487-8; 344:253; 565:184; 583:378; 629:327; 698:55⁹₉; 730:330; 772:578; 784:355; 795f.:104-121.

ε 232v.l.:282; 324:372.

ς 15f.:104-121.

η 20-1:107f.; 153f.:334-5; 315:270.

θ 74:178; 308-9:557; 318codd.:236; 493:104-121; 494-5:21-65; 500-2:fn.65; 545:561.

ι 53:528; 137; 346; 194:334; 281-2:382; 284:189-90; 362:116; 381:60-1.

κ 26-7:244-5; 41:551; 99:354; 219:464; 259-60:480; 436:315.

λ 274:292; 341:6; 506f.:287f.; 525:331; 526Ar.:110; 528f.:66-103.

μ 15Zen.:42; 40:203; 394f.:500-24; 438:221.

ν 141:557; 169:127; 230(v.l.):153; 297:275; 388:440-1; 435:550.

ξ 60:244 and 343; 96:567; 268f.:463; 433:241; 506:557.

ο 168:257; 322:567-8.

π 15-16:282; 28:250; 188-9:227-8; 218:491; 279-80:445-6.

ρ 175:574-5; 233:16; 320-1:343; 355:240; 463-4:365-6.

σ 41:459; 119:541.

τ 178:440; 324:547; 390-1:242; 395:48; 479:172; 518f.:489-90; 565:526.

υ 345f.:540-551; 365:144.

χ 197-8:352;316:546;347-8:308;408:441;499-500:282.

ψ 118:230;286:54;366f.:303-4.

ω 57:216;81:246;124:438;174:546;197-8:155;390:276;400:263;456:546;540f.:
157-218(B).

—schol.:—

δ 246:440-1; θ 77:66-103; θ 494:523.

§ Honestus, GPh

2412-3:209-10.

§ Horace

Carm. 4.6.13f.:66-103.

§ Hymni Homerici

Ap.:5:204;50:361;134-5:442-3;304:496-7;430cod.M:463;518-9:308.

Aphr.:244:271.

Dem.:51:352;151:440-1;171-2:120;183codd.:112;279codd.:ibid.;310,313:93-4;
429:397-8.

Herm.:137:503.

27.9:582.

28.1-2:154;5-6,15:174-5.

§ Ibycus, SLG

151.1-2:78.

§ Il.Lat.

208,241:320.

§ Il.Parv.

233f.:fn.52;F 12 Allen:ibid.

§ Il.Pers.

253:360-388 § 2(b).

§ Leo Philosophus

AP 9.201.2:183.

§ Leonidas(of Tarentum), HE

2009,2011:569;2040:429;2415codd.:179.

§ Livius Andronicus

Eq.Tr.:360-388 § 3(b)(iii).

§ Lucan

1.674f.:525-585;2.494f.:66-103;5.504,505:104-121.

§ Lucian

~~AP~~ AP 9.367.7:116.

§ Lucillius

AP 11.106.1:56.

§ Lycophron

194:487-8;249-50:172;251f.:540-551;314f.:fn.92;346f.:345;676:487-8.

§ Manethoniana

2.3-4:105;3.70:135-6.

§ Marcellus Sidetes, GDK

63.40:458.

§ Maximus

152:403;258:399;303:533;347codd.:147.

§ Metrodorus

AP 14.130.2:147.

§ Mimnermus, IEG

12.3-4:190-1.

§ [Moschus]

Meg.21f.:489f.

§ Musaeus

84:197;95:521;203-4:249.

§ Naumachius, GDK

29:-18:388;67:414.

§ Nicander

~ Q.ix:389-417.

Alex.24 ~28:411;124-5:402;333:188;421:492;541:399. Ther.6:462;254-5:409-10;

256-7:407-8;348codd.:554;399f.:463;428:402;437:399;451:489;458:452;483:61;

557:406;728:399;804:452.

§ Nicias, HE

2761:312.

§ Nonnos

Nonn. ~ Q. in general:122-156(B); and Latin poetry:fn.51, fn.87; gnomad in:388.

D.:

2:267:209-10; 421f.:157-218(A); 474:189. 3:388f.:530-3. 4:200-1:282; 454:505.
 5:487:190-1. 6:46:43; 58f.:5; 117-8:470. 7:106:362. 9:194:232. 11:119-20:193;
 319:311; 351:495. 15:20:411. 16:259:411. 17:139-141:185-6; 166:364. 18:33:364;
 37:456. 20:94f.:292-6; 178:506; 399:128. 21:91:487. 24:74:164; 177:158; 199:495.
 25:182:155. 26:109:499. 27:26-7:560-1. 28:73:456. 32:166:87. 34:99-100:113;
 129:32; 238-9:335. 36:3f.&89; 157-218(A). 37:7f.:122-156(A); 39:459; 525:209-10.
 38:16f.:fn.87; 31f.:5. 39:118-9:34. 40:32:254. 41:173 ~ 179:191-5; 256-7:514-6.
 42:535f.:12; 541-2:438-9. 43:123:168. 44:6f.:fn.87. 45:92:92; 155:312; 325f.:
 fn.87; 328:510. 46:125:411.

Met.

7.46corr.:358; 10.20:362; 21.9:7.

§ Oppian, Hal.

1:237:531; 246:356; 436:551; 560:543; 733:173.
 2:15-16:146-7; 240:395; 300:53; 480:487; 625:518.
 3:479:15; 534, 536:424.
 4:139:99; 408-9:55.
 5:64:477; 113:522; 123:21; 269:550; 322:492; 331:264; 512:357; 579f.:489f.

§ [Oppian], Cyn.

1:257:547; 383:175-6; 513:262; 523:113.
 2:286:492; 436-7:175-6; 475:67f.
 3:102-3:494; 348:414.
 4:155:424; 213:518; 302-3:397-8; 374:305; 440:262.

§ Oracula Sibyllina

1.2:179. 3.693:114. 5.481:515. 11.132:1; 145:67f. 14.114:90; 218odd.:196.

§ Orphica

A. 37:5; 207f.:5; 234:305; 237:442-3; 249:261; 268:4; 287:249; 406odd.:305; 529:332-3;
 533-4:267-8; 536f.:104-121; 636:346; 685:163; 687:178; 699:174; 732odd.:147; 777-8:

116;787:116;839:225-6;891:241;911:329;934:578;995:164-5;1005:492;1122:499;

1147:363;1158:116;1185:352;1218-9:442-3;1329:116.

H. pr. 2corr.?:275-6;14.12:287f.;37.1-2:180;45.5,54.2:25.

L. 11:58;234:312;309corr.:107;343:10;421-2:371;442:132;496:403;527corr.:135-6;
550:338-9;646:81.

F ~~2~~⁴0.3:318;292.2:364.

§ Ovid

Ep. 16.110:180-1. Fast. 4.495-6:449-50. Met. 6.165f.:525-585;8.357f.:90;8.819f.

& 10.368:104-121;10.374:129.

§ Pantelius, GDK

23.7-8:129.

§ Panyassis

F15.1 Kinkel:296.

§ Parmenion, GPh

2602:98.

§ Paulus Silentarius

Ecphr. Soph. 960-1:386.

§ Petronius, Sat. 89

Laocoon in:525-585.

1f.:1-20,1-2;4:126;11:353-9;13f.:fn.80;15f.,17-18:353-9;19f.,23:476-7;29f.:

449-53;31:457-8;41:478;44f.:476;47:448.

§ Philostratus

Her. 4.3:66-103.

§ [Phocylides]

Sent. 7:420;172:13.

§ Pindar

O. 14.24:183; N. 1.48f.:467;3.43:274. Paean 8.1f.:534,539. F172.4corr.:19;185:

505.

§ Pisander, GDK

Suppl.6.18.1:309.

§ Proclus

H. 4.7:114.

§ Propertius

3.13.63-4:525.

§ Quintus Smyrnaeus

i 5:492;76f.:399-415;76:485;128:377;159:571;196:351;295:409-10;315f.:530-3;
360:386;368:568;404:167;413:62-3;428:495;434:230;472-3:70;527:264;536:490;
562:275-6;568:371;573:539;610corr.:300;640:158;681:58;686f.:180-3;692:56;
705:533;711:90;765:558;794:361-2;826-7:104.

ii 11:49;20:527;42:287f.;68:275;76:258;122:246;131:107;200-1:469-70;250:
533;311:240-1;312:305;315:385;333-4:277;344:244;351:504;415:275-6;485-6:550;
502:359;523:533;575-6:492;626-7:514-6;630:157;655:524.

iii 6:466;15:179;33:408;45:371;51:106;74-5:465;83v.l.:462;191:524;202f.:
530-3;314:99;344:502;437:509;479:352;504:534;588f.:457-8;614:276;639:181-2;
674:186;748f.:160;786codd.:463.

iv 24:415;28:247;32-3:260;42:299;64:104-121;95:11;[99a]:284;122:305;258:
67f.;269:215;303f.;307f.:260-305;307:270;317:99;320:271;325:330;337:246;
358corr.:245;401:408.

v 17-18:518;20-1:462;28:411;40:458;106-7:198-9;136:579;154:292-3;199:~~292-3~~
287f.;207-8:567-8;234:184;238:171;309-10:275-6;311:238;325f.:405-6;337:432;
344codd.:fn.30;390corr.:403;405:556;462:275-6;498:490;568:534;623:104;643:
456.

vi 1-2:190-1;5:343;14:502;41:553;44:546;45:440-1;69:501;72:104-121;81-3:
486;83:420;116f.:360-88 § 3(a);187:337;200:462;245-7:441;275:522;315:253;
370-1:273;409:536;410:492;422codd.:fn.42;427:564-5;490codd.:179;582:505;
607-8:223.

vii 10:527;46:251;65:413;69:551;72:209-10;142:108;143:396;146-7:508-9;215:
226;258v.l.:180;292f.:281f.;293:286;310:419;330f.:489f.;331:431;372-3:347-8;
426:509-10;455:489;464:537;486f.:581;495:350;543:335;569:531;580-1:509-10;
602f.:87;630f.:281f.;664:87;666:419;689f.:281f.

viii 23:303;90:503;114-5:476-7;131:132;242:192;259:263;343:490;344-5:181;
351:98;353f.:217-8;362:432;451f.:157-218(B);452:220;468:182;474:289;490;
104-121.

ix 15:2;39-40:157;69:536;94-5:487;195f.:327;224:67f.;244:462 & 492;267:353;

274:444;279:62-3;303:384;313f.:157-218(B);347conj.:65;352:62-3;364:535-6;
384corr.:409;403:305;405:216;408:403;415:382;435-6:347-8;445:253;462:202;
536:260.

x 18:1;43:301;47codd.:187;142:419;305:417;380:486;402:361-2;42⁷~~6~~:300;437:
104-121;444:533;452:132.

xi 74:492;84:399;151-2:437-8;155:506;190:571;205:412;210:493;245-6:459-60;
319:550;336-7:68;418-9:538;466:409;471:143;500-1:1-2.

xiii 23f.:360-88 § 1(a);26:242;107:431;122corr.:107;147-8:568-9;259:554;417-8:
438-9;433codd.:200;434:481;453f.:467-9;478-9:477;506:183;533-4:282;548:397-8;
555:419;563:549.

xiv 28corr.:539;45corr.:282;55:555;62:349;67:157;71:351;72f.:459-60;76:189;
97-8:476-7;103:501;110f.:360-88 § 2(b);117:438;148:270;149f.:337;181:109;228:
190-1;277-8:535-6;284:491;316:537;334:501;364:445-6;371-2:347-8;379:501;393-4:
568-9;447:338-9;453:155;475corr.:449;534-5:189;546-7:438-9;550:35;551:432;
552:400;552-3:442-3;580-1:397-8;580:544;602:254;621-2:568-9;625-6:447-8;633:
509-10;646:397-8.

§ Seneca

Ag.636f.:66-103;710f.:535-9. Phaed.534f.:90.

§ Silius Italicus

2.515f.:104-121;4.603-4:292-6;727f.:104-121;774f.:525-585;5.77f.:66-103;
9.287f.:157-218(A);13.36f.:1-2.

§ Solon, IEG

13.64:561.

§ Sophocles

Use of :fn.16.

Aj.814:150;988:110-11. Ant.1005f.:fn.87. Laocoon:389-417 § 2. OT 301:fn.13.
Sinon:360-388, esp. § 3(b)(v);fn.72.

§ Statius

Ach.1.52f.:160-1;422:90;540-1:160;2.61:129. Sily.1.1.46-7:149;3.1.89f.:104-
121. Theb.5.599f.:489f.;8.545f.:129;10.118-9:193;198f.:11;632f.:104-121.

§ Stesichorus

SLG:88:fn.43;ii18f.:434-5,19f.:353-359. 89:7-8:83;9-10:108.

?Stesich. PLille, 241:310.

§ Sulpicius Maximus, GVI

1924.17:181.

§ Synesius

H.4.3,5.28:183.

§ Theocritus

1:9:237;71:518;126:155.

4:8:99;41:225-6.

7:104:263;115-6:106.

13:21:269.

17:21:195;97:105.

22:174v.1.:215;192:2;208:209-10.

24:48:569.

§ [Theocritus]

9:6:197.

25:32:343;88-9:519;227:16;257:143.

§ Theognis, IEG

446~ 1162f.:561;461:115;787:521.

§ Triphiodorus

In general:1-20,104-121;and Q.:esp.122-156(B),218-259,525-585; ~ E. Alexandr.?:

526-8;catalogue:306-335(B);Cassandra in:525-585;Sinon in:360-388 passim.

2:104-121;6:1-2;35:377;44:152;45f.:1-2;51f.:1-20;52:315;54:279 & 287f.;59f.:

122-56(A);59:135-6;62-102:122-56(B);62f.:428;73:492;74:122-56(B);79:ibid.;

80:140;84f.:150;85f.:122-56(B);90f.:332-3;90:122-56(B);99:37;100f.:42⁴₇-7;100:

122-56(B);104:44 & 142;110:218-259;120f.:21⁸₈-259;121:104-121;126f.:251-2;132f.:

1-20;133f.:ibid.;139:336;140:337;153:315;172f.:1-20;172-3:3-4;174:19;176:323;

177:306-335(B) & 325-6;180:326;181-2:306-335(B);182-3:329;184f.:151-3;185:

428;200f.:329;212:360-88 § 4(a)(i);215:337;217:345;219f.:218-259;230f.:337;

235f.:353-9;239:ibid.;239f.:389-417 § 1;239:32;243f.:353-9;248f.:ibid.;252:

242;254:567-71 & 571;258f.:360-88 § 1(b);264:374;265:422;285:35-6;286f.:360-

88 § 3(b)(ii);290:355;297:360-88 § 4(b);300f.:423f.;300-1:423;302:360-88 § 4(a)

(iii);306:424;308f.:436-7;310f.:544-5;316^f₈:434-5;324:490;325f.:459-60;340f.:

441-3; 346:434-5; 347:440-1; 350f.:436-7; 357:264; 358f.:530-8; 369:555; 371-2:
 535-9; 374f.:ibid.; 375:539; 376f.:526-8 & 540-551; 377:575; 384:443; 398f.:fn.92;
 412f.:560-1 & 567-71; 412:264; 417-8; 526-8; 419f.:552; 422:556; 434f.:553-7; 435:
 235; 437:1; 446-7:500-525; 458:139; 501:436-7; 512f.:fn.52; 531-2:19; 539:334; 543:
 471; 559f.:157-218(A) & 437-8; 566f.:438-9; 683f.:459-60.

§ Tyrtaeus, IEG

12.18:62-3.

§ Tzetzes, on Lyc.

340:389-417 § 1; 344:fn.52.

§ Valerius Flaccus

5.624-5:207.

§ Virgil

and Q.:esp.353-359(A.2.25f.), 360-88(Sinon; V.and tragedy), 389-417 and 525-
 585 Excursus(Laocoon); catalogue:306-335(B).

A.:

2.13-14:1-2; 15:104-121; 16:124; 18:305; 21f.:345; 25f.:353-359; 27f.:337; 32-3:
 443; 37-8:393-4; 44 et circ.:21-65; 45:394; 54-6:395; 55:561; 57f.:361-2; 61f.:
 251-2; 63-4:361-2; 70:360; 77f.:420; 107:374; 109:1-2; 112f.:1-20; 112-3:157-218(A);
 112:124; 114, 121:1-20; 145:422; 152f.:374; 185f.:1-20; 196f.:77-8; 199-200:447-8;
 203:457-8; 209:456; 215:448; 229f.:560; 233:436-7; 235f.:424-7; 236:428; 238f.:441-
 3; 240:525; 246-7:525-585; 248f.:434-5; 261:315-6; 263:321; 264:329; 403f.:535-9;
 405:ibid.; 612f.:438-9.

3.183:525.

4.407f., 5.605f., 668f., 6.517f., 7.377f.:525-585.

6.261:261.

9.598f.:66-103.

C

GREEK INDEX

Ἀγελείη:416. Ἀγυρίς:3. Ἀδαμας:195. Ἀδην (Ἀδην):435; constantly 538.
 Ἀέναος ποταμός:182. Ἀέξεν:ἄμωρ Ἀ. 232. Ἀηδών ~ Ἀειδών:491.
 Ἀηρ ~ αἰθήρ:197. αἰγλήεις:104. Ἀιβονεύς-ωνεύς:179. αἰσῆος:

133. αἶνός γάμος:547. αἰόλος Ἴρις:193. αἶσα (τις αἶσα):527.
 αἶψος:208. Αἰών:191-5,194. ἀκάματος:77,152;(χείρ)195. ἀκηδεῖν:
 376. ἀκήρατος αἶψός:555. ἀκόρητος πολέμοιοισim.:87. ἀλευόμενος:68.
 ἀλιτεῖν:417. ἀλκιμος ἀνὴρ:67ε. ἀλλοθε:197. ἀλυσίς:212. ἀμετρίχος:
 276;adv.—α 483. ἀμφοροςsim. ἡελίοιο:499. ἀμπεχε ἀμφεχε:357. ἀμύμων:
 75,262. ἀμφί:ἀμφ' ὀφύν—403. ἀμφιμάρπτειν:276. ἀμφιμάχεσθαι:~~64-5~~
 64-5. ἀμφιπερι—verbs:472. ἀναιδέα ὀβέε:537. ἀναλθής:408. ἀνα—
 ρρηγνύναι:209-10. ἀνέμβατος:450. ἀνηγής:159. ἀνηρεῖψαντο:475.
 ἀνίη:376. ἀντίθεος:288,316. ἀνωΐζαι:331. ἀπειρέσιος:212;adv.—ον:
 121. ἀπεχθής:479. ἀπονέεσθαι:278. ἀποτηλόθι vel ἀπὸ τ.:228.
 ἀπωθε(ν):293. ἀργαλέως:13-14. ἀργύφεος:536. ἀρεα:42. ἀριτεῖν
 ἀνὴρ:28. ἀρίπετος ~ ἀρίχετος:533. ἀταλάφρων:107. ἀταρβής:32,74.
 ἀταρτηρός—ως:40. ἀτρεκέως εἰδέναι:579. ἀτρομος of persons:465.
 αὐτάρ:+name:138; εἴπειτα 139.

βαρὺ εὐθέος:502. βλοσυρός:462,492.

γάρ, runs of:53/54/56. γεραιότερος:284. γίγν—γίν—:2.

δαΐψειν ~ δηοῦν:351. δαίφρων:377. Δαναοί et al.:157. δάπεδον &
 πέδον:310. δάκιος:490. δέδαεν:83. δέχνημαι:585. δηρὸς:90,230.
 δηρόν:ἐπὶ δ., 39. διεδής:144. δῖος:δῖα θεά etc.:414; ~ ἐβδόλως
 424. —δημητος—κημητος:514. δολοφροσύνη:27. δολόφρων:364. δορί:
 72. δοῦριος ἵππος:110. εὐαλθής—ἀλθης:408. εὐσηχής:225.

εἶδος of gods:106. εἶ etiamsi:249. εἶς:εἰς εἷν:209-10. εἶσαί'εἰν:
 121. εἴκηλος:348. εἴποθεν:509. εἴφατο μῦθον:24. ἐννεοῖαι:ἐπ'—ίης
 4. ἐξυπαλύσκειν:502. ἐπί:pro ἐνί?:147; of 'attendant circumstances':
 485. ἐπιγηθεῖν:148. ἐπιειμένος sim.:366. ἐπικλείειν 'call by name':
 453. ἐπιμαίεσθαι c.gen.:571. ἐπιψάειν c.accus.:551. ἐποίχεσθαι c.dat.:
 343. ἐρημαῖος:489. ἐρίθυμος:318. ἔριν(ν)ύς:547. ἐρυσίπολις:fn.71.

ἐσθλός: 48, 49, 85-6, 413, 424. ἐόπετε (ἐόπ-): 307. ἐξαρεῶν: 569.
 εὐδελος?: 258. εὐμελίας: 321. εὐπτόλεμος: 26. -εύς: -έες etc.: 71.
 εὐφρονέων εὐφρων sagacious: 53, 245, 287.

ἡρόεν ἄντρον: 450. ἡίκτο: 411. ἡν κε: 226. ἡώς: 98, 117, 229, (246).
 ἡχέεω ἄλς sim.: 429. ἡών (ἡϊών): 131.

θάρος ~ κάρτος: 60-1, 99, 273. θεή: 112. θεός ὄνειρος: 119. θεόδμητος
 -κμητος: 514. θεπέβιος vast: 398. θυμός mettle: 149; περὶ -ῶ: 396.

ἰδε': 318. ἱερός στρατός 246; -ὸν ἄλτυ 235; cf. s. ἡώς. ἰότητι: 6, 377.
 ἰούλοι: 309. (F) ἰόόθεος: 319. ἰωχμός: 206.

κακός: ἀνάγκη 388; μόρος 544; φήμη 558. κακοφραδίη: 554. καλίη: 489.
 κάρτος ~ θάρσος: v. θάρσος. καταβαίνειν embark: 269. καταντίον: 67f.
 καταπρήσαι: 568. κατατίθεσθαι don: 303. κατεναντίον-α: 173. κεδάσσει
 ~ κεδάσσει: 567-8. κεκλήγοντες (-ότες -ῶτες): 58. κελαιφεινός sim.: 491.
 κενε(ός) τάφος τύμβος ἑήμα: 484. κερδοδύνη plur.: 387. κηκίειν etc. of
 smoke: 505. κητώεις: 314. κινύρεσθαι: 486. κλυτὸν ἄλτυ: 289. κόσμος:
 435. κρατερόφρων: 338-9, 386. κρήδεμνον: 440-1. κρύπτειν: ἔκρυψε 443.
 κύδμος: 183. κύδος: 273; κ. ὀπλίσσειν 273.

λαρὸν μέθυ: 501. λάβιος: ὄρος 132; ὀφρύειν 402. λείπειν: ἔλειπτο 472.
 λοιγός: 462.

μαίνεσθαι ἄνδ' sim.: 533. μακρός: Ἰση 180-1; τείχεα 509-10. μαργος γλῶσσα:
 553-7. μαρμαίρειν: of stars: 105; eyes: 537. μεγακήτης: 151. μέγας: 49, 65,
 227, 232, 386, 440, 459, 510. μέλλειν: 48. μέροπες subst.: 265. μέφ' ὅτε/ὅταν:
 296. μέχρις ἐπὶ o. gen.: 179. μήδεσθαι: 448. μῆνις: 488. μογερός: 419,
 581. μόθος: 22. μυρία ~ mille in exaggerations: 519. μυριάζειν: 563.

νίεεθαι :217; νίεατο — ετο ? :463. νυ :in καί ν' κεν etc.:93-4, 395; in commands:220. νύξ of blindness:400-1. νῶιν i.q. ἔμιν:257. ||| ξανθὸς Ἀχιλλεύς: 274. συλοχοίαι : ἐν ἱ ξ, sim.:531.

ὀβριμόθυμος :322. ὀβριμον ἔργον:443. οἶ =gen.:121. οἶδμα :432. ὀίβιον ἄετον :78. Ὀλεθρος?:543. ὀλολύσειν :441. ὀλοφώιος :552. ὀμαδος :577. ὀμηθής :216. ὀμῶτ c.dat.:57; πάντες ὀμῶτ etc.:211. ὀρμαίνειν c.infin.: 88. ὀλόμενος i.q. ὀλοός :451-2; Κήρ ~ ὀλοή Κήρ 473-4. οὐτάσειν ~ βάλλειν :532. οὐτω/οὐτως :299. ὀφέλλειν :90. ὀφελον : ὡς ὀφ. sim.:266.

πανευδής :434. πάντοθε :105. παρ(')αυτοῦθι :348. παρειά :309. παρθέμενος i.q. ἐνθ— :62-3. παρθενικός :555. παροιδεν : ὡς τὸ π. :128. περί : θυμῷ 396; φρένας 116; φρεσίν 241. περιεταδόν :361-2. πινυτός νόος(νόημα) : 525. πιφάνε-άεκ— :39. πολύμητις Ἀθήνη :154. πολύτροπος :171. πολυχανδής :264. πόρδαλις ~ πόρδ— :580. που impressionistic :350, 449. προφερέτατος — ἐβτερος :275-6. πτήεις :5. πτύχες = μυχοί :452.

ρῖς ὄθεν :404.

ῥάον ~ ῥάω :153. ῥαοφροσύνη plur.:23. —ῥατο —ῥετο :13. ῥτονόεις : 63. ῥυφελός — λώδης :409, 449. ταναός i.q. τεταμένος :58. τείχεα Τροίης sim.:1. τέκμωρ ~ τέλος :2. τεκτοσύνη :83. τέλος πολέμοιο :438. τεράτα :522. τεύχη :174-5. τηλεθρόντα etc.:122. τις i.q. πᾶς τις : 254. τοῖα/τοῖον the following:7, 374. τρεῖν :180. τρίσειν τρύσειν : 431. Τρώιος ~ Τρωικός :19.

—ύα :140. ὑπερθυμος :161, 400. ὑποδρῆύειν :134. ὑποτλήναι :388. ὑψίκομος :123.

φαίμεν(ος) : ὡς φ. 66. φέρειν spell :520. φθεῖσθαι φθίβεσθαι :351. φρένες : περὶ φρένας 116; φρεσίν 241; ἐπὶ/ὑπὸ φρένας 521; ἐν φρεσὶ θέεσθαι etc.:229.

χαροπός : 118. χθισόν i.q. χθές : 11. χρεῖω : 261. χρεμέθεν : 150.

ῥυέεθαι : 518. ὡς ... ὡς : 120.

139: on ἥππου συμπάτε'ος. Add: -'This is the Homeric epithet(ctr.110n.):

θ 492-3, 512, [V_{30c}]'.

page 133, 4(a)(i): after '375-6' insert: 'V's Sinon begins(his second speech) in a similar fashion, A.2.108-9: '.

fn.51: Nonnos poeta doctus: see now Vian, Prometheus 4, 1978, 157f. Of course we must as often as not be viewing through a cloud: Nonnos had more Hellenistic material(original or derivative) at his disposal than do we.

POSTSCRIPT

A commentator may reasonably be expected not merely to finish his task with the incorporation of Addenda but to comment himself on the way ahead.

It has been shown that the tales of Sinon and Laocoon in Quintus tread rather a different path to that trodden by Virgil. It may be that all is not lost for those who thirst after Roman sources. The net could be cast wider. I frankly doubt whether any definite results would emerge from such an exercise; but it would do no harm to look, and anyone dealing with the topic in the future will have to leave assertion and generalisation aside and look hard.

Quintus composed a Christian poem. Any examination of his language must take account of Christian verse, from whatever period. Further: there is no doubt that a systematic perusal of imperial prose would throw much light on Quintus' poem. I have not undertaken this daunting task myself in the composition of this commentary; indeed I have said little about prose usage, because I believe that the partial presentation of data is normally less desirable than silence.